Suffering Childhood in Early America

Violence, Race, and the Making of the Child Victim

ANNA MAE DUANE

VISIT…

Suffering Childhood in Early America

This page intentionally left blank

Suffering Childhood in Early America

Violence, Race, and the Making of the Child Victim

ANNA MAE DUANE

The University of Georgia Press
Athens & London

© 2010 by the University of Georgia Press
Athens, Georgia 30602
www.ugapress.org
All rights reserved
Designed by Walton Harris
Set in 11 on 14 Adobe Jenson Pro

Printed digitally in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Duane, Anna Mae, 1968–
Suffering childhood in early America : violence, race, and the making of the child victim / Anna Mae Duane.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-8203-3383-0 (hardcover : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 0-8203-3383-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Children — United States — Social conditions. 2. Violence — United States — History. 3. Victims — United States — History. 4. Suffering — Political aspects — United States — History. 5. Political culture — United States — History. 6. Ethnicity — United States — History. 7. Racism — United States — History. 8. Sex role — United States — History. 9. United States — History — Colonial period, ca. 1600–1775. 10. United States — Social conditions — To 1865. I. Title.
HQ792.U5D795 2010
303.6083'097309032 — dc22 2009047880

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data available

ISBN for this digital edition: 978-0-8203-4198-9

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS *vii*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS *ix*

INTRODUCTION. Suffering Childhood in Early America *1*

CHAPTER ONE. Children in the Hands of Satan: Captivity, Witch Trials, and the Dangerous Child *19*

CHAPTER TWO. This Infant State: The Child Nation and Infanticide in the Early Republic *58*

CHAPTER THREE. Pregnancy and the New Birth: Reproduction, Performance, and Infantilizing Republican Mothers *97*

CHAPTER FOUR. The Revolutionary Child: Slavery, Affective Contracts, and the Future Perfect *125*

EPILOGUE. The Materials and Metaphors of Schoolwork *165*

NOTES *177*

INDEX *205*

This page intentionally left blank

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Eva's Farewell to Slaves *2*

2. Indian Woman and Young Girl, by John White *21*

3. Tituba and the Children, by A. Fredericks *43*

4. Hunter with Dogs *173*

5. Napoleon Francois Charles Joseph *174*

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

WRITING IS NEVER as solitary an exercise as it would appear. This book would never have come into the world if it were up to me alone to bring it forth. Rather, my thinking about this topic has benefited from the generosity, kindness, and humor of colleagues and good friends. My largest professional debt is owed to Lenny Cassuto, who, as a mentor and as a friend, has always gone beyond the call of duty. I am deeply grateful for Lenny's unfailing support, impeccable intellectual engagement, and unflagging optimism. His influence on my thinking and on my career cannot be overstated. This book grew out of my dissertation, and my thanks go to the other members of the committee, Susan Greenfield and Karen Sánchez-Eppler. My debt to Karen runs far beyond the date of the defense. Her work on childhood has shown me what to strive for, and her friendship and engagement have been both inspiring and sustaining. I am grateful to Bob Tilton and Michael Menard for providing the professional space and encouragement that allowed me the time I needed for this research. Many thanks are due to University of Connecticut librarian Sheila Lafferty, whose researching acumen came to my rescue on more than one occasion. Colleagues Clare Eby and Kathy Knapp have provided nourishing friendship and support. Walt Woodward and Rob Forbes, my colleagues in UConn's history department, have both helped me think through some knotty problems in this book. I am grateful to the University of Connecticut for providing me a research leave. This project has also been greatly enhanced by the time allotted by an NEH faculty fellowship grant. I am grateful to Yale's Gilder Lehrman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance, and Abolition for a fellowship that helped support the work of this book. I owe many thanks to David Blight, Tom Thurston, Dana Schaffer, and Melissa McGrath for providing such a wonderful environment during my time there. The conversations I had during my time at the GLC helped to advance my work in significant ways. Thanks are also due to the Folger Shakespeare Library for allowing me to attend a seminar taught by Karen Ordhal Kupperman. What I learned there, and continued to learn from Karen's work, has shaped the way I think.

In the day-to-day work of writing and revising drafts, I could not have

asked for a better circle of readers and friends than what I have lovingly termed the "New York wine-and-cheese-writing-group." Sarah Chinn, Sophie Bell, Joseph Entin, Hildegard Hoeller, Lori Jourisek-Falls, Jon Hartman, and Jeff Allred have improved much of this book through their careful reading and insightful comments. Other New York friends to whom I owe a great debt for their sustaining conversations (and homebaked goods!) include Rachel Adams, Elson Bond, Bill Gerke, Christina Carlson, and Ken Monteith. The Nineteenth Century Women's Writers Group has provided a sense of intellectual community that has sustained me since graduate school. Out of the many friendships that have grown out of that group, I am particularly grateful for having met Robin Bernstein. I am in awe of her impeccable scholarly eye and her unfailing wisdom. My thinking and my writing have benefited greatly from our conversations. The Fordham publishing group has provided the inspiration — and the deadlines — that helped move this project forward in its final stages. Thanks to Jennifer Gilchrist for starting the group. It is only one of the many gifts her friendship has given me. Conferences have brought me in productive conversation with a host of brilliant people including Marion Rust, Joanne Van Der Woude, Lucia Hodgson, Dennis Moore, Jim Stewart, Robert Levine, Carol Singley, and Pat Crain. I am deeply grateful to Erika Stevens at the University of Georgia Press for her support of, and patience with, this anxious first-time author. I owe great thanks to the Press's readers for their astute and insightful suggestions on the manuscript, and I am very thankful to Jon Davies and Molly Thompson for all their hard work during the production process.

The writing of this book was slowed, but greatly deepened, by a series of lessons in how much children can teach us. My son, Connor, continues to enrich my thinking and my life every day. I am grateful to my partner, Matthew, whose moral support and irresistible martinis have made our journey together a pleasure and an adventure. My sisters, Susie and Helen, are a great source of both fun and strength. My mother, Maureen Duane, and my father, John Duane, did not live to see this book published, but their love and guidance are what made it possible. It is dedicated to their memory.

Portions of chapter 1 were published in *Messy Beginnings: Postcoloniality and Early American Studies*, edited by Malini Schueller and Edward Watts (Camden: Rutgers University Press, 2003) and are reprinted by permission of Rutgers University Press, copyright ©2003 by Rutgers, the State

University. Earlier portions of chapter 3 appear in the Norton edition of *Charlotte Temple*, edited by Marion Rust (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010), and *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*, edited by Leonard Cassuto, Benjamin Reiss, and Clare Eby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). My discussion of Venture Smith in chapter 4 is culled from a longer analysis in *Venture Smith and the Business of Freedom*, edited by James Stewart (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010). I am grateful to those publications for allowing me to expand my arguments in this forum.

This page intentionally left blank

Suffering Childhood in Early America

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Suffering Childhood in Early America

LITTLE EVA WRUNG TEARS and won hearts because she suffered. Her death at the very heart of Harriet Beecher Stowe's 1852 international best seller, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, inspired thousands of commemorative artifacts, dozens of performances, innumerable sobs, and for many readers, an emotional and political sea change. In the novel, little Eva literally distributes pieces of herself to white and black characters as she succumbs to a malaise explicitly tied with the pain of slavery. A turning point for Eva's already fragile health comes as she hears about the violent death of old Prue, a brutalized slave mother whose body bore the scars of many whippings and whose heart had been broken by the loss of her own children. In a pivotal scene, the abuse of a helpless elderly slave becomes inextricable from the privileged white child's own suffering and death. Overhearing of Prue's lonely, painful death "down the cellar," Eva becomes more "spirit-like" as "her large, mystic eyes [become] dilated with horror, and every drop of blood [is] driven from her lips and cheeks."[1] As she tells Tom, "[T]hese things sink into my heart." "They sink," she repeats, "into my heart."[2]

It's no surprise that Eva confesses her pain over Prue's fate to the enslaved Uncle Tom — by this point in the narrative it has been well established that Tom and Eva are soul mates. As they play together, work on reading and writing and engage in philosophical conversations, the white child and black slave get along famously because, Stowe suggests, they are equals. Scholars have pointed out how Eva and Tom's friendship infantilizes Tom, and they often see that dynamic as one particularly striking example of Stowe's generally patronizing treatment of black characters throughout the novel.[3] The

Figure 1. *Eva's Farewell to Slaves*. Engraved by Baker and Smith. (University of Virginia)

appealing friendship of Tom and Eva glosses over the fact that the terms of their dependence and the extent of their vulnerability are widely divergent. Eva, after all, is a privileged white girl who stands to inherit some of the very slaves she mourns. Tom, as an enslaved adult, has been deprived of the ability to access the prerogatives of manhood — a right to protect his family and own his own labor.

I am more concerned with another, related side effect of the comparison between the privileged white child and the adult male slave. Yes, both Tom and Eva are cast as charming, helpless, loving creatures. They also suffer at length and die. The very vulnerability and dependence that makes them such charming playmates seals their doom. Stowe insists on their mutual childishness to elide these differences and render them both weak players unable to bend slave society's rules. Slavery breaks Eva's heart and Tom's body because neither of them has the power to alter slavery's grasp. Yet it is their very defenselessness, their childlike inability to shape their own

circumstances, that invests them with the emotional power to change the hearts and minds of those who witness their demise.

Little Eva's influence remains among us — as the eyes of poster children plead with us to cry (and then donate) on their behalf and as war correspondents train their focus on child victims, they are drawing from the same volatile combination of disarming vulnerability and unbearable suffering that brought Little Eva's admirers to tears. Although many have critiqued the politics of the suffering child, few can deny its power.[4] Even Ann Douglas, perhaps the most famous twentieth-century critic of sentimental literature, writes with nostalgia of the "archetypal and archetypically satisfying scene" of little Eva's death.[5] After a generation of intense scholarship analyzing the cultural work this fictional little girl performed, questions about the foundations of her power remain. Why did a child's suffering body represent the epitome of sentimental expression (or excess, depending on one's perspective)? More specifically, why does a novel designed to make its readers "feel right" about the evils of slavery turn to the suffering body of a little white girl to occupy its affective centerpiece?[6]

This book seeks to understand the work of children like Eva, and the complex relationship between vulnerability and violence that she helped to articulate in early America. Little Eva's ability to channel the pain of slavery, I suggest, was the product of a centuries-long process in which the child's symbolic role in mediating cultural and colonial violence shaped the definition of childhood itself as a site of vulnerability, suffering, and victimhood. This study traces that process by exploring how the child victim emerged in colonial and republican American literature and culture as symbolic shorthand for the toll of racial and cultural conflict. As historical children often bore the brunt of colonial conflict, the suffering child in literature became a figure that evoked emotional responses that could then be parsed along racial and ethnic lines. As a symbol of the new nation — and as a symbol of those who would be subjugated by the colonizing process — the vulnerable and often victimized child emerged as an essential element in structuring "natural" ways of thinking and feeling about the often violent process of nation-making.

The child had powerful political, social, and emotional resonances in early America, and thus the figure of the suffering child provides a key entry point into the messy processes of the era. John Winthrop, Cotton Mather, and other early settlers read the pain and demise of children as symbols of

the colony's spiritual and economic health (or lack of it). John Winthrop's oft-cited fascination with the allegedly monstrous stillborn child of Anne Hutchinson is just one example of his interest in reading an infant body as evidence of the colony's troubled status. As Jay Fliegelman, Caroline Levander, Russ Castronovo, and others have argued, late eighteenth-century thinkers and politicians in the United States drew on Locke's philosophy to cast the figure of a threatened child as an analogy for the colonies' relationship with a tyrannical mother country.[7] In early America, as lawmakers increasingly looked to the child to prop up emerging ideas of consent, as Thomas Paine looked to the vulnerable child to make the case for breaking with mother England, and as writers looked to the victimized child to justify subordinating Indians, women, and slaves, the image of a child being hurt emerged as a crucible through which the often violent work of establishing power was processed, and ultimately justified, by early Americans.

Metaphors based on the child — a malleable figure whose historical meanings changed in tandem with the circumstances of actual children — appeared at the heart of many cultural conflicts and the realities that emerged from those conflicts. My choice to emphasize metaphor, not only in literature, but also in court transcripts, political broadsides, and diaries, reflects my belief that literary form provides a powerful means of accessing historical content. By demonstrating how rhetorical comparisons between suffering children and marginalized people shaped the meanings of *both* terms, I work toward a framework for understanding how white, native, and African cultures in early America continually shaped each other's ways of thinking and feeling. Properly understanding how metaphors of childhood functioned in early America means attending to the changing historical circumstances of early American children — the pivotal figures on whom powerful narratives of both infantilization and savagery depended.

Infantilizing metaphors, after all, gain their power from the implicit injury, suffering, and death that await the vulnerable child. When Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1788 that "to give liberty to, or rather, to abandon persons whose habits have been formed in slavery is like abandoning children," he relied on his interlocutor's awareness of what awaits any child who did not have the protection of a vigilant adult — hunger, want, and often, death.[8] In early America, a harsh place for the weak and vulnerable, the image of the child is often the image of suffering — and the repeated strategy of yoking

the suffering child with an excluded and besieged subject (Indians, women, and slaves, to name a few) reveals a powerful line of colonizing logic in which dependence and vulnerability are assigned great emotional weight and are simultaneously established as deadly liabilities. In other words, as the child was deployed to disempower various Others, the child itself was cast as increasingly vulnerable — a victim in the making.

As children emerged as victims in actual colonial conflict, and in the stories early Americans told themselves about that conflict, the child figure became a bridge that linked familiar ways of thinking about power and discipline with the novel problems raised by the New World. Children had long been used to symbolize subservience, but in the New World those old associations also became freighted with a sense of deadly helplessness. When early Americans sought to make sense of intercultural contact — and the conflict that often resulted from that contact — they turned to the child to help them articulate their own feelings of vulnerability, while also displacing that vulnerability away from the white adults who "should" have been in control. In 1702, Cotton Mather riveted his readers with the spectacle of an Indian captor raining "blows on [a] forlorn infant" while the English adults were helpless to protect the child. In 1692, when John Hale went to Salem to visit the afflicted girls in the Parris household (a town Mary Beth Norton has demonstrated to be rife with fear of Indian attack), he carefully chronicled his own emotional response, so different from the allegedly stone-hearted Indians whose threat was never far off: "[The girls] were . . . tormented so as might move a heart of stone to sympathize with them, with bowels of compassion for them."[9] Although his heart was moved, he was unable to do more than witness the suffering inflicted by a power that terrified him. When captivity narratives sought to demonize Indians by featuring the archetypal "infant dashed against the stones," when proslavery writings struggled to accommodate the horrors of slavery by portraying enslaved people as children in need of care, and when popular culture sought to keep women out of the political sphere by aligning them with children, writers turned to the image of a suffering child to embody the vulnerability of the subject in question and to allude to the violence that lurked just around the corner. In the process, the vulnerability, suffering, and victimization that occupied the forefront of these accounts became integral to many definitions of childhood itself.

Rethinking colonial metaphors of childhood means rethinking a host

of philosophical and political structures propped upon particular images of childhood. The besieged child's role in the work of philosophers such as John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and other Enlightenment theorists helped to articulate social contract theory — a theory that, as John Rawls and Martha Nussbaum argue, forms the bedrock of a good deal of modern American political thought. In a related vein, the child's role in articulating meaningful consent — a dynamic that predates the American Revolution but would become vastly elaborated by the Revolution's concerns — has left a particularly contentious legacy. John Locke's engagement with the child as a test case for the boundaries of power and consent offers at least two trajectories for understanding how the child helped to articulate citizenship. On one hand, as Holly Brewer has written, the emerging emphasis on consent from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries progressively denied children even the small power they had previously been able to access via birthright and bloodline. The child effectively came to represent all that should exclude a subject from citizenship. Gillian Brown, on the other hand, has argued that Locke's assertion that "children are not born in this full state of equality though they are born to it" created the conceptual framework that would allow a young and rather weak set of colonies to demand their independence from a powerful mother country.[10] Rather than placing a stake in the ground between the two opposing poles of this argument about whether consent privileges or diminishes the power of the child, I present several case studies to illustrate how *both* meanings were deployed in America's journey from colony to nation. More precisely, I suggest that the shifting meanings of childhood — and the narratives that were told about American children — are part of Americans' continually evolving, and often contradictory, understanding of meaningful consent, and the rights that attend that consent. For instance, my final chapter discusses the radical potentiality of the "revolutionary child" — a figure that emerges as American Revolutionary rhetoricians drew on Locke's portrait of a child's potential to claim independence from an overbearing parent country. Alternately, my second chapter examines how the child victim in the Indian captivity narrative provided a foil for the trope of the stoic Indian, and ultimately contributed to a cultural conception (articulated explicitly in several Supreme Court cases) that Indians could never achieve the properly — and permanently — subservient role that a properly childlike ward of the state must assume. In other words, because Indians refused to be good children, and thereby insisted on con-

trolling fate and maintaining sovereignty over their land, they could not be accommodated as colonial wards.

Even as this study illustrates how the child figure can be a site of both radical empowerment and debilitating vulnerability, my focus on suffering children necessarily shifts the bulk of my analysis toward the definition of childhood perhaps most familiar to us in the twenty-first century: the child victim. The conceptual binary between the allegedly autonomous adult and dependent child has naturalized a host of remarkably long-lived dichotomies. The commonsense assumption that dependent and vulnerable subjects are inherently less valuable still resonates in both political and literary discourses. When Ralph Waldo Emerson insisted in 1841 that Americans were "not minors and invalids in a protected corner," he was building on a long-standing tradition through which the fantasy of the admirable self-reliant American individual was forged in contrast to a politically invalid child.[11] Martha Nussbaum argues that the continued influence of contract theory — which, as Holly Brewer has illustrated, pivots on the difference between consenting adult and nonconsenting child — deprives children, people with disabilities, and members of underdeveloped countries of basic dignities and opportunities.[12] As Caroline Levander points out, the philosophical divide between adult citizens and infantile wards of the state has "curtailed more far-reaching efforts to rethink the full range of individuals' ethical engagements in a social world."[13] The work of disability scholars, also concerned with naturalized assumptions attached to independent bodies, has much to teach us about approaching the dependent figure. I seek to emphasize early America's fascination with childhood vulnerability in order to, as Lennard Davis has written, "replac[e] the binary of docility and power with another — impairment and normalcy. Impairment is the rule, and normalcy is the fantasy. Dependence is the rule, and independence grandiose thinking."[14] The child, particularly the suffering child, has long been an instrument for demonstrating a particular form of impairment, and metaphors of childhood have transferred those associations of deficiency to other members of the population. Rather than simply proving infantilizing narratives incorrect (they are), or arguing that children are somehow inherently independent (they aren't), I argue that attending to the work performed by the suffering child in early American literature and culture allows us to think through how *all* subjects are dependent and vulnerable — and the costs of pretending otherwise.[15]

The specters of dependence and fragility that surround the suffering child have long haunted the study of early American literature and culture. Scholars continue to struggle with a portrait of authorship that reiterates an artificial divide between a childlike voice, mediated and dependent, and the more valuable authentic, resistant voice of an autonomous author. From the debate over the authenticity of Olaudah Equiano's recounted childhood, to worries over clerical editorializing of female authors of captivity narratives, to efforts to locate "true" Native American subjectivity in William Apess's anglicized story of hardship and conversion, scholars remain unsure how to read the heavily mediated voices of many early American authors.[16] Underlying these debates is a powerful, if unstated, desire for affirmation of an autonomous subject whose voice reflects an unmediated glimpse into a self-authored identity. Focusing on children in early American texts offers no easy solution to the problem. There are precious few firsthand accounts of childhood experience in early America, and still fewer by minority children. Because children do not allow for the illusion of an unmediated voice, a focus on their presence means rethinking who is worth listening to, and how we might best listen. Reading early American literature with the child at the forefront demands an attention to what Ann Laura Stoler calls the "intimate spaces" of colonial work — spaces that often remain "half-articulated, that unfold in homes and bedrooms as powerfully as in legal tracts and novels."[17] Finally, engaging the suffering child in early American literature means having patience for the very things that frightened early Americans and, arguably, frighten modern Americans as well — the vulnerability, dependence, and pain that often accompany childhood.

Faced with the dearth of firsthand accounts by children themselves, a recent generation of scholars has devised canny strategies to try to elicit the world of children. For many, engaging in an intellectually honest discussion of early American childhood requires restricting analysis largely to how adults wielded children in rhetoric. As Karen Sánchez-Eppler points out, for "most scholars, changes in the status of children are of note for what they indicate about shifts in social priorities — that is, about the changes in the desires and experiences of adults."[18] Historians such as Karen Calvert and Holly Brewer, on the other hand, have searched for traces of childhood experience in the material artifacts children used and the legal documents that chronicled the problems they faced. James Marten culled a wide variety of artifacts to elicit the experience of children during the Civil War.

Gary Cross's work on children's toys has helped to elucidate changing attitudes about children in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[19] Work by Courtney A. Weilke-Mills and Patricia Crain has sought entry into the words of early American children by studying the history of the books those children read.[20] Sánchez-Eppler has culled religious tracts, literature, and photographs to tease out the cultural work of nineteenth-century children, and in her most recent work has offered beautifully revealing close readings of later nineteenth-century children's voices, ranging from the bravado of New York City newsboys to the earnest diaries of middle-class schoolgirls.[21]

Building on the work of these scholars, I too seek ways to elicit the hidden voices of children in texts in ways that can reveal children's presence as historical actors. Rather than seeking to make an elusive subject conform to standard ways of reading, *Suffering Childhood in Early America* argues that the very problems early American children raise for modern readers demand new ways of approaching our own assumptions about what constitutes historical agency, literary authority, and genuine individuality. As Paula Fass has argued, historical action is not always a straightforward act of making something happen, but must include defensive, passive, and appropriative acts to truly account for the vast range of exchanges that comprise a particular historical moment.[22] Acknowledging the difficulty of recovering the authentic experience of children, I listen creatively to both adult representations of children and the influence children may have had on those representations. I do so by asserting that metaphor, far from being divorced from historical reality, or from being a bludgeon imposed on it, actually emanates from the very meanings history makes available to the speaker or writer.

In the past thirty years, cognitive scientists have demonstrated what literary scholars have long known: metaphors are the breeding ground for conceptual thinking. Linguists George Lakoff and Mark Turner have argued that "[f]ar from being merely a matter of words, metaphor is a matter of thought."[23] Patrick Hogan, summarizing the recent findings of cognitive scientists, describes metaphor as "one of the most significant features of radical creativity, even one of its primary sources."[24] The metaphorical reliance on childhood in philosophical, legal, and literary engagements with the New World made the child an intense site for this sort of creative thinking. Put simply, the child was both familiar enough and malleable enough to map new meaning on frighteningly novel situations.

Much of the scholarship on the rhetorical work of the child in early America, and on infantilizing narratives in particular, works on a premise that psychologists such as Amos Tversky and Andrew Ortony originated, sometimes described as "feature matching" or, to use Patrick Hogan's term, "information transfer."[25] In this model, the reader or listener scans one term of the metaphor for meanings that can be transferred to the other. To use a modern example, imagine that after an evening of babysitting, the babysitter declares, "Little Amy was an angel." In this case, the speaker defines Amy by the second term, "angel." The word "angel," however, has many connotations. There is the avenging archangel Michael, who smote enemies without mercy. There is the angel of death, terrifying and implacable. There are prophetic angels, heralding the birth of a savior or the doom of a city. Of course, Amy's mother would know that none of these meanings applied. She would scan the possible meanings for the one that suited little Amy — a sweet, guileless cherub, who brings only happiness and comfort wherever she goes. That lexical possibility — the sweetness of an angel — becomes transferred to Amy's behavior and demeanor.

The concept of information transfer has significant explanatory power for how metaphors of childhood worked in the colonial and early republican United States. In Europe, the child — like the slave, the wife, and the servant — had long been deployed as a symbol of servitude. Only the child, however, could represent complete vulnerability and dependence. Slaves could rebel, wives could wander, and servants could find other employment. Only children — particularly very young children — were wholly dependent on those who had more power. Coming from a tradition in which the child represented a dependent subject, European colonists depended on old meanings of childhood to create infantilizing metaphors that answered the need for a new conceptual structure required by the colonizing process. By calling others "children," colonists were able to tap into the associations that the term "child" carried — dependence, subservience, and inferiority being the most important for their purposes.

Frantz Fanon drew on an understanding of information transfer when he sought to explain the psychological effects of racism and colonialism in *Black Skin, White Masks*. "A white man addressing a Negro," he wrote, "behaves exactly like an adult with a child and starts smirking, whispering, patronizing, cozening."[26] In Fanon's analysis, the exchange is simply understood — the white man transfers the simplicity and inferiority of a

child to the black adult standing before him. But reading infantilization as a one-way street, as a weapon that simply diminishes the subject being infantilized, obscures a much more complex engagement. Metaphor is better understood as a dynamic conceptualization where *each* term of comparison becomes shaped by its juxtaposition with the other.

Information transfer is only one aspect of how the child functioned in many of the most striking conceptual revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As Mark Turner argues, most metaphors do not function in a "direct, one-way, and positive" manner.[27] Rather, both terms of a metaphor exert influence on the other, subtly changing the ways in which each term is understood. Turner, along with Giles Fauconnier, has posited that metaphorical thought is a particularly salient example of what he calls "conceptual integration," or "blending."[28] In the words of Turner, the two terms of the metaphor exert force on each other to create a "blended space" where each set of meanings influences the other, thereby producing a new matrix of possible options.

Infantilization, a key strategy for colonists across both time and space, is not a rhetorical club with which those in power simply disempower an individual by comparing him or her to a child. Rather, the structure of the child metaphor often changes the meanings of *both* terms. As Richard White has written in his analysis of the "middle ground" between European and Indian from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, "[c]ontact was not a battle of primal forces in which only one could survive. Something new could appear."[29] Metaphor enacts precisely this process of taking two clashing meanings and creating something new. In order for the child to be used to define Indians, slaves, and women, definitions of the child itself had to be stretched in ways that changed the meaning of childhood itself, resulting in blended meanings that exceeded the sum of the two original terms. Metaphors of suffering childhood not only allow, but demand a way of reading that Josh Bellin has deemed "interculturative criticism." In this model, we can no longer read "American literature and culture . . . simply as a battle between whites and others, the powerful and the dispossessed, but rather as a site of continual, reciprocal encounter that results from multiple players influencing one another." Attending to the child's role in early American literature requires moving beyond the reductive categories of the powerful and the powerless to make room for what Bellin calls the "processes of appropriation and accommodation, destruction and creation."[30]

Reading metaphors of infantilization as producers of blended meanings allows for a more complex way of reading infantilizing statements such as Jefferson's comparison of a freed slave to an abandoned child. Undoubtedly, Jefferson's comparison disempowered enslaved people. He also disempowered the child as it had been fashioned by Revolutionary rhetoric. American rebels metaphorically aligned themselves with an unjustly suppressed child who was being denied his natural right to freedom by a tyrannical mother country. Against this backdrop, Jefferson's deceptively simple comparison subtly realigns meanings of both the slave and the child. Writing in an era in which the child was invoked as a symbol of the rebellious colonies, and later as an infant nation, Jefferson subverts these potentially empowering definitions of childhood by emphasizing the child's utter dependence. In order to create a new meaning in which slaves were perpetually unfit for freedom, Jefferson transforms the revolutionary child of potential and promise into a helpless figure desperate for a strong guiding hand.

Acknowledging the material grounding of metaphorical thought not only provides new ways of reading the work of literary children, but also makes space for the experience of historical children. Cognitive theorist Howard Gardner, among others, asserts that we build metaphors based on "procedural schemas" — what we see, feel, and do in everyday life. Gardner, building on recent studies, argues that people create metaphors that are "grounded either on how an object could be handled, its shape, or both."[31] An insight both simple and revolutionary — the conceptual work metaphors do often emerges from the physical work things do in the world — prompts the realization that the conceptual force of the child in early America was often intimately related to *what the child was actually doing* in the New World. After all, if children weren't actually in subservient positions in European households, comparing Indians to naughty children simply wouldn't work. Bringing this insight to representations of the child in early America allows for a new way of accessing the often elusive influence of children, particularly minority children. As Indian children pined and sickened under English "education," as slave children were orphaned, as white children were caught in colonial conflicts, their experiences — as witnessed by adults, and sometimes articulated by children themselves — altered the range of meanings attached to childhood itself. Thus, although the voices of children themselves are often absent, or at best heavily mediated, in much of early American literature, acknowledging that material conditions and metaphor-

ical representations are bound together in fundamental ways allows us to engage the presence and the experience of people supposedly submerged by metaphor's heavy hand.

Metaphors of childhood were shaped by several shifts the New World initiated in what children were able to do, and what their presence meant. To begin with, the demands of the environment increased the child's value as a physical and cultural laborer, and as the literal embodiment of the colony's future. Captain John Smith, in his tireless attempts to advance the cause of the Virginia colony, exhorts English readers in 1616 to send over the very "fatherlesse children" who were such a burden in a Europe still ruled by first-born sons.[32] While the "fatherlesse children" themselves may not have immediately enjoyed a substantial improvement in their quality of life in the New World, the demands of colonization made them a far more valuable commodity than they had been back in England. The demands of the frontier helped to overturn old beliefs in bloodline and birth order — notions from which domestic and international governance was derived.[33] In its place came a New World model in which children themselves emerged as a form of wealth. This newfound investment in the child as an economic resource dovetailed with a growing tendency to figure the child as an emblem for the success of the colony, and later, the nation itself. The child often stood in for the colonists who were trying to articulate their relationship to authority, as in John Winthrop's famous speech aboard the *Arabella*, when Winthrop conjures the ideal sense of community by invoking the love a mother feels for a child, or later, when newly-minted Americans would refer to themselves as an infant nation.

At the same time that colonial children grew in economic and symbolic importance, the need to create structures of power over colonized people required that colonists draw on older visions of the child as a dependent subject. Seventeenth-century missionary John Eliot often drew on infantilizing metaphors to proselytize to the Indians. By the 1830s both government and Native American sources would refer to the U.S. executive branch as the "great white father." And of course, paternalism would become a key strategy in justifying domestic slavery. Because the child could invoke associations with both a soon-to-be empowered subject and the perpetually dependent noncitizen, figurations of the child provide a conceptual vantage point from which to reconsider what Ed Watts and Malini Schueller have called the "oxymoronic simultaneity" through which colonization was enacted and re-

sisted at the same time.[34] Reexamining the child during a time of profound fluctuation between colony and empire renders the seemingly ubiquitous work of infantilization a pivot point on which affective, racial, and ethnic components continually redefined one another.

Even as European colonists vacillated between seeing the child as an emblem of the colonizers' potential and seeing it as a symbol of the colonized's servitude, the alternate childrearing strategies of native and African people challenged, threatened, and tempted European settlers by offering different views of children's functions in the world. For English settlers whose notions of religion, government, and society were conceptually grounded in a particular articulation of adult-child relations, these "other" children offered a substantial critique of the stability of those relations. When New England colonists came up against what they felt to be the scandalously indulgent childrearing of Indians, they were forced to reassess their own attitudes toward children, even if only to recommit themselves to rigorous Puritan pedagogy. The logic of climatology threatened to render strict parental vigilance insufficient, however. The mere proximity of indulged native children, combined with the "wild" influences of the American environment, endangered the relationship between white parents and their children by potentially infusing colonial children with American disobedience. Increase Mather worried in 1676, "If we learn the way of the Heathen and become like them, God will punish us by them."[35] Not surprisingly, it was the colony's children who were most likely to learn "Heathen" ways.

Perhaps most important for this study are the conflicts that placed Indian, white, and African children in positions of extreme vulnerability and suffering. As early Americans sought to come to terms with the violence — and the politics behind the violence — of colonization and slavery, the suffering child emerged as a place where writers and thinkers could formulate moral and affective responses to the suffering of powerless and vulnerable people. For example, my final chapter examines the underexplored problem of slavery's effect on black children — and how the suffering of those children may have affected white adult perpetrators, witnesses, and advocates. As the work of David Eltis and the Transatlantic Slavery Database has revealed, by the late nineteenth century nearly 50 percent of all slaves leaving Africa were children, many not older than seven or eight years old.[36] Whether justifying or decrying the plight of the slave child, the presence of millions of such children across American history demanded some sort of response.

One aspect of that response, to be sure, was to infantilize slaves in order to assert power over them. But to do so meant reformulating what children meant, and what they needed, so that the act of infantilization could in fact serve the writer's purposes. For slavery apologists, the vulnerability of orphaned child slaves lent itself to narratives in which benevolent slaveholding patriarchs offered the protection and sustenance so desperately needed. For antislavery writers, writing about the slave child's separation from his or her parents inevitably brought new emphasis on the importance of loving child-parent bonds.

Reflecting the reciprocal relationship between historical and metaphorical children in early America, each chapter in *Suffering Childhood in Early America* creates a dialogue between a set of historical accounts that create a particular kind of symbolic child, and an author who speaks back to the narrative fashioned in those accounts. For the first half of each chapter, I move through a range of historical materials — journals, laws, Supreme Court decisions, childrearing manuals — to create a sense of the symbolic meanings being attached to suffering children in a particular context. The second half of the chapter brings those materials to bear in an analysis of an important literary resource, often written by a person whose subject position (as an Indian, woman, or slave) invoked comparison to a child. In the process, I explore how the infantilized subject offers new ways of thinking about childhood and the dependence it had come to represent. Rather than following a strict chronological progression, I engage in a deep analysis of several different deployments of suffering childhood, often charting how that particular variation evolved over generations. To draw on Raymond Williams's formulation, dominant cultural memes are continually in play with both residual and emergent ideas, and take on different permutations within different geographical and cultural landscapes.[37]

My first two chapters focus on what I call the colonial child — a figure whose ability to move deftly between English and Indian cultures functioned as both threat and promise. "Children in the Hands of Satan: Captivity, Witch Trials, and the Dangerous Child" briefly examines early English colonial texts from Virginia, including materials on Pocahontas, to establish the extent to which children functioned as cultural emissaries in contact zones and to explore the implications of that function for English understanding of children's value — affectively, economically, and politically. I then move to New England to focus on representations of children in *The Journal of John*

Winthrop (1630–49) and seventeenth-century Indian captivity narratives to explore how children in these texts bridge the gap between the "divinely" ordained authority of the Puritans and the rebellion and chaos that colonists associated with the native population. Focusing on the child figure in these texts allows for a space where we can chart previously unnoted points of reciprocity between Puritan and Indian thought. The second half of the chapter argues that the affective power that childhood suffering accrued in colonial conflict set the stage for the hysteria that Salem's "afflicted" children elicited.

The second chapter, "This Infant State: The Child Nation and Infanticide in the Early Republic," examines how the popular childrearing philosophies of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau shaped beliefs about the relationship between controlling one's body and controlling one's mind. In their work, and in the childrearing material that followed in their wake, children provided a template for cultivating and discerning the type of interiority that would be required in a nation of virtuous citizens. In the second half of the chapter, I turn to William Apess's 1829 *Son of the Forest* to explore how Apess crafts his own childhood abuse at the hand of Indian parents both within and against the politically disastrous stereotype of the hard-hearted Indian stoic (a stereotype created in captivity narratives where brutal Indian captors would abuse white children).

The next section on the "revolutionary child" argues, against conventional wisdom, that infantilization in the late eighteenth century could be an empowering move. The Enlightenment's radical revision of what childhood meant — what, say, a child should have about his or her life, what an adult owes a child, and perhaps most important (and most elusive) how one is supposed to feel about a child — forms an integral part of the intellectual and imaginative work that allowed U.S. residents to rebel against Mother England. Undoubtedly, the child was a site of incredible political potential for the white men who would draw on the image of an unjustly restrained youth to justify rebellion against the home country. In my third and fourth chapters, I demonstrate how women and blacks throughout the Atlantic world were able, with varying degrees of success, to access and inhabit the radical possibilities the revolutionary child promised. Rather than trying to distance themselves wholly from childhood, women and slaves both sought to revise what childhood meant and, in the process, carve out a new way to relate to the political fathers who had so much control over their fate.

My third chapter, "Pregnancy and the New Birth: Reproduction, Performance, and Infantilizing Republican Mothers," illustrates how the fetus takes on near-mythological properties in the wake of women's potential new role in the new republic in the late eighteenth century. Legal, medical, and political trends of the era converged in ways that suggested women could have considerable control over the reproductive process — and by extension, the future of the new nation. Susanna Rowson's 1791 *Charlotte Temple* and Hannah Foster's 1797 *The Coquette* captivated early American audiences because of their provoking questions about the stakes of pregnancy and, in particular, the ways in which childbirth kept women from claiming their own bodies or labor in ways that would qualify them for any sort of political agency.

The final chapter, "The Revolutionary Child: Slavery, Affective Contracts, and the Future Perfect," culminates many of the arguments I have been tracing throughout the book. I incorporate John Locke's *Second Treatise of Government*, constitutional theory, and popular literature to sketch a definition of what I call "the revolutionary child" — a child not limited to the United States, but rather a symbol circulated throughout the Atlantic during the Age of Revolution. I suggest that what made the child so powerful — and so compelling to outnumbered colonial rebels — was that Locke's definition of childhood flouted conventions not only of hereditary power, but also of physical domination. Locke's insistence that fathers must watch over their offspring actually empowers the child, making the patriarch into a mere guardian, a bystander to a process that he must not impede. With this metaphor holding sway, linking slaves and children could be a dangerous proposition. In a little more than a generation, however, this rhetorical pattern reversed itself. Welding the child to the slave had become a common ploy of slavery apologists and abolitionists alike. This conceptual shift occurred, I suggest, as the definitions of the slave and the child shaped each other. Put simply, as slavery created millions of orphaned and suffering children within the United States, and as black writers wrote of their childhood pain in the first person, childhood itself became emotionally and rhetorically linked to experiences of terror and pain. Diaries, slave narratives, and other historical sources indicate that, as white witnesses described the horrors visited on children, and as slave children sought to describe their own experience, they altered the palette of meanings attached to childhood itself.

The epilogue looks forward to possible sites of future study that would allow scholars to trace the complex relationships between material and metaphorical children. Antebellum schools, many of them meticulously documented, are rich sources for studying how the child was figured in antebellum reform movements, and in particular, in the debates over Indian removal and African colonization. These materials, and others like them, provide a powerful opportunity for engaging and honoring the mediated voices of minority children in early America, and, I hope, for forging a methodology for listening for a variety of silenced and subjugated voices still lurking, barely heard, in early American archives.

CHAPTER ONE

Children in the Hands of Satan

Captivity, Witch Trials, and the Dangerous Child

WHEN HENRY SPELLMAN, a boy about thirteen years old, finds himself abandoned in an almost unimaginable wilderness in 1609, his reaction seems — to modern readers at least — strikingly understated. "Unknone to me," he informs the reader, "he [John Smith] had sold me to him [the little Powhatan] for the town called Powhatan and le[ft] me with him."[1] If the boy expected better treatment than he received at the hands of his protector, it's difficult to discern from his description. Like any good adventurer, Spellman decides to make the best of it, learns the language, and works his way next to the "great Powhatan," who initially treats him "very kindly," providing him with more "vitals" than the English, who were short on supplies.[2] In 1596 Sir Walter Raleigh indicates no special concern when he leaves "a boy of mine called Hugh Godwin to learn the language" in West-Indian Guyana, where prospects of recovery or even survival were arguably even less certain than in Virginia.[3]

In truth both Spellman and Raleigh were savvy practitioners in an economy of child exchange as practiced in a colonial setting. In one respect, the concept of placing children in a rival's family was a continuation of a long-standing tradition described by Patricia Fumerton, among others. In Fumerton's account, children functioned as "trinkets" to be traded among the upper classes in late sixteenth-century Europe. She compares the Anglo-Irish system of fosterage to the practice of the South Pacific Kula Ring, where shells and necklaces take on significance precisely because they are given and received.[4] Certainly, early settlers in the New World drew on the

European practice of child exchange as a means of forging political bonds. But the New World had an additional set of demands that, in turn, expanded the role of children in both the imagination of English settlers and in their own experience as cultural emissaries.

As with every other value system, the English conception of the child was radically challenged by conditions in the New World. The difficulties of colonization, and the proximity to a culture whose attitude toward children differed largely from their own, subtly challenged — and likely influenced — the way the early English colonists thought about children and their role in society.[5] Certainly, contact with America did not eradicate old beliefs about the role of children, but the New World reshaped English beliefs in ways that have yet to be fully acknowledged or understood. In turn, the new meanings attached to children altered the rhetorical palette available to writers and thinkers who drew on the child to articulate the distribution of emotional and governmental power.

The English colonists' understanding of children — and, by extension, the constructions of emotion, government, and discipline metaphorically propped on the child — was shaped through both the fear and desire created by contact with native beliefs and culture. This chapter focuses on three key stories about early America, and not coincidentally, about early American children: the tale of Pocahontas, the tale of the English child taken by Indian captives, and the tale of afflicted children of Salem. Each of these stories reveals moments of intercultural exchange. Taken together, they demonstrate how children emerged as powerful conduits through which adults worked through their own responses to the violence of colonial conflict. Colonial children — both English and native — mean more in these narratives than has yet been acknowledged. Because children functioned in colonial America as culturally malleable beings, these early American stories of suffering childhood reveal previously unnoted moments of transcultural exchange — and allow us to read how deeply intertwined Puritan and native structures of thought and feeling became in the first generations of settlement and encounter.

Investing in the Child

In an environment where sheer numbers can mean the difference between a successful plantation and starvation, every individual takes on increased im-

Figure 2. *Indian Woman and Young Girl*, by John White, 1585. Note the English doll in the little girl's hand. (© The Trustees of the British Museum, AN25876001)

portance. In Virginia, contacts with Indian families as well as the hardships of the frontier seem to convince the English that women and children are necessary to begin a plantation. In 1619, the Governor of Virginia requests that "afitt hundreth might be sent of women, Maide young and uncorrupt to make wifes to the Inhabitants and by that means to make the men there more settled and lesse moeable who by defect therof (as is credibly reported) stay there but to gett something and then to return for England, which will breed a dissolution, and so an overthrow of the Plantacion."[6] It takes the pleasures of domestic life, it seems, to fix men in one place and keep them from "dissolution" and riot. And women are not the only people necessary to keep the colony running; children also figure as valuable assets in the New World. In budding plantations, where both safety and sustenance were to be found in numbers, unwanted children are no longer items to be discarded; they are eagerly sought. In his 1616 "Description of New England," John Smith actively solicits "fatherlesse children" — perhaps the individuals of least value in the English social system — to populate the New England colonies.[7] In a later tract, the 1643 *New England's First Fruits*, the author hopes to stir up some "well-minded [citizens] to cloath and transport over poore children, Boyes and girles," because the colonists are "wanting hands to carry on our trades, manufacture and husbandry there."[8] As William Wood points out in *New England's Prospect*, "a subject [is] precious in the eye of his prince, where men are so scarce."[9]

An increased recognition of the child's worth emerges in various promotional claims that consider healthy children a major selling point of the colony. In his 1632 publication, "New English Canaan," Thomas Morton explicitly ties children with other thriving forms of life in the New World. After a litany of various commodities that prosper in New England, Morton tells his readers, "New Canaan is like wise for the increase of the reasonable Creatures, Children, of all riches being the principal."[10] He goes on to point out that the child mortality rate is far lower in New England than in Virginia. The author of *New England's First Fruits* also notes that children do better in the New World: "God hath so prospered the climate to us, that our bodies are healthier, and Children there born stronger, whereby our number exceedingly increased."[11]

Although much of the promotional material of the seventeenth century suggests a general appreciation for the child as a general commodity, depictions of a young Pocahontas provide some striking examples of the valu-

ation of an individual child. John Smith's writings provide a particularly fertile glimpse of the juxtaposition of Old and New World conceptions of adult-child relationships. On one hand, his lack of commentary about leaving Henry Spellman in Virginia — as disconcerting as it might be to modern readers — was well within the boundaries of what Fumerton deems the "aesthetics of child gifts" that functioned as the norm in England and Ireland at the time.[12] On the other hand, when Smith describes a young Indian girl — Pocahontas — we see a far less detached attitude toward the figure of a child. His first description of her, in the 1608 *True Relation*, is marked by focused attention that yields admiration and respect. He finds a "childe of tenne yeares old" who exceeds the rest of the Powhatan people — both adults and children — in "wit, [and] spirit."[13] When he writes Queen Anne in anticipation of Pocahontas's 1616 visit, Smith remembers her as a "childe of twelve or thirteene yeeres of age," and writes of her "compassionate and pitifull heart," which "gave me much cause to respect her."[14] In addition to the (now intensely controversial) instance where "she hazarded the beating out of her owne braines to save mine," Smith relates another incident where the "tender Virgin" risks her life in the service of a culture other than her own. She advises his party how best to avoid her father's revenge, even though "had [Powhatan] knowne, hee had surely slain her."[15] One reason for Smith's increased appreciation might be based on class consciousness. Certainly Pocahontas, whom the English considered analogous to a princess, would deserve more attention than a servant or a boy adventurer. Yet her social standing alone doesn't account for the admiration she inspires as an individual. Pocahontas is a female, and of a supposedly inferior culture, yet Smith praises her in terms that focus admiringly on individual personality traits.

As arresting as Pocahontas might have appeared as a young girl, the love she seems to elicit from her powerful father makes her even more remarkable to the English. Several narratives reveal a wonder at the affection a powerful King has for one of his children. In the letter to Queen Anne, Smith calls Pocahontas "the King's most deare and beloved daughter."[16] Ralph Hamor concurs with this assessment in his 1615 *True Discourse*, where he describes Pocahontas as Powhatan's "delight and darling."[17] The impression seems to linger. John Smith, in an account published seven years after her death in his *Generall Historie of Virginia*, takes pains to point out that she was the "King's dearest daughter."[18] Arguably, it is their knowledge of Powhatan's fatherly

affection that inspires the English to take Pocahontas prisoner in order to gain leverage with her powerful father. If so, they were not disappointed. According to Hamor's account, Powhatan is deeply distressed by the event because of "the love he bare to his daughter and the love he bare to our men his prisoners." He sends word that "whensoever wee pleased to deliver his daughter, he would give us . . . satisfaction of his injuries done to us."[19]

In spite of the father's expressions of concern, Powhatan-English relations are still volatile until Powhatan receives word that John Rolfe, who, according to Hamor, "had been in love with Pocahontas and she with him," had married his daughter.[20] Only then is a substantial peace negotiated. John Smith credits Pocahontas's "being so detained" as the pivotal event in English-Powhatan relations, writing Queen Anne that the "Collonie was by that means relieved, [and] peace concluded."[21] "Ever since" the marriage, Hamor relates, "we have had friendly commerce and trade, not onely with Powhatan himselfe, but also with his subjects about us; so now I see no reason why the Collonie should not thrive a pace." Although the English had attempted both diplomacy and force, Hamor credits paternal affection as the gateway into successful colonization. He writes that it is through "this love by this means [the difficulties] with Powhatan concluded."[22] In other words, the English render Powhatan manageable by playing on his tender feelings for his child.

At a later point in Hamor's text, Powhatan again privileges his child over material benefit when he refuses the English request for his other daughter. Although the English promise him "treble the [marriage] price of his daughter in beades, Copper, Hatchets, and many other things," Powhatan will not send his child to become the "neerest companion, wife and bedfellow" to a prominent Englishman.[23] Although he first protests that his daughter is already promised to another, he cites his affection for his child as the primary reason for refusal. Hamor's extended attention to Powhatan's explanation would seem to indicate that he found it remarkable:

> [H]is answere herunto was that he loved his daughter as his own life, and though he had many Children, he delighted in none so much as in her, whom if he should not often beholde, he could not possibly live, which she living with us he know he could not; having with himselfe resolved upon no termes whatsoeer to put himselfe into our handes, or come amongst us, and therefore intreated me to urge no further. . . . [H]e [the King] hath a pledge, one of

> my daughters, which so long as she lives shall be sufficient, when she dieth he shall have another childe of mine, but she yet liveth: I holde it not a brotherly part of your king to bereave me of two children at once.[24]

Here the power of affection skews the politics of child exchange. Although Powhatan acknowledges the transfer of children as a means of cultural assurance — he speaks of the pledge symbolized by his daughter Pocahontas — he protests that his emotional ties to his daughter prevent him from capitalizing on the opportunity for political advancement the English offer him. Of course, Powhatan might simply have chosen to represent his refusal in a manner least likely to offend the English. Yet for the English representatives, a powerful chieftain's official declaration that he must submit to the love he feels for his daughter would likely have challenged long-held notions of the hierarchical relationship between parent and child.

Pocahontas, the daughter who does remain with the colonists, becomes an emblem of the potential "civility" of Virginia's native people. As Rolfe himself declares, he marries Pocahontas in part because he intended to "make her a Christian," and he succeeds.[25] John Smith relates in *The Generall Historie* that Pocahontas had "become very formall and civil after our English manner."[26] He writes to Queen Anne that Pocahontas had "reject[ed] her barbarous condition" to become the "first Christian ever of that Nation, the first Virginian [that] ever spake English, or had a childe in marriage by an Englishman a matter surely . . . worthy a Prince's understanding."[27] First met as a child, and kidnapped as a young woman, Pocahontas represents the possibility of capturing and ultimately mastering the "barbarous condition" that prevailed in the American wilderness.[28] Indeed, her transformation is so complete that she is deemed worthy to attend a royal masque in London.[29]

Since the successful negotiation of Pocahontas's youth not only "civilized" her as an individual, but also ameliorated the constant threat of Powhatan warfare, which made the landscape such a treacherous wilderness, it's hardly surprising that colonists would come to consider the cultivation of the Indian child as a requisite for mastering the New World. In 1619, a committee is drawn up in Virginia to facilitate the "converting and education of Threescore Infedells Children."[30] However, as Helen Rountree has pointed out, the Virginia Indians resisted handing over their children to English households.[31] The *Records of the Virginia Company* reflect this reluctance as

they describe the committee's worries about actually obtaining the children they mean to civilize, wondering "by what lawfull means they would procure them and after keep them that they runn not to theire parents or frends, and their said Parrents or friends steale them not away."[32]

As for Pocahontas, the one Indian child the English could claim as a successful acquisition, her status as bargaining chip and cultural go-between invested her with symbolic power that would only accumulate force as the centuries passed. As Robert Tilton's work illustrates, the Pocahontas story emerges as a touchstone for successive generations of Americans who needed to make sense out of the colonial violence, and the legacy of that violence, that would erupt in her wake.[33]

As is the case with most people transformed into symbols, Pocahontas did not fare well. Married to John Rolfe, who expressed much anguish over the prospect of marrying a "strange" wife, she went to England where she met John Smith in a charged encounter that invoked her childhood memory of him, as well as the colonial process that charged the terms "father" and "child" with new and painful meanings. She addresses Smith as "father." Smith replies that his low social status bars him from accepting such a title from a princess. However, she insists on maintaining the parent-child relationship that she must have felt had explanatory power for their relationship: "Were you not afraid to come into my father's Countrie, and caused feare in him and all of his people?" she asked. Why then, would Smith "feare you here I should call you father: I tell you I will, and you shall call mee childe, and so I will be for ever and ever your Countrieman."[34] This would be their last meeting. Pocahontas would never make it back to America. She was too ill to make the journey, and was buried in Gravesend, England, thousands of miles from her birthplace. After her death, her infant son became imbued with symbolism, as successive generations trace their ancestry, through him, to Pocahontas with great pride. The child the English watched with bemusement as she cartwheeled through the native village became transformed into a transcultural mother whose regenerative power knows no bounds.

In many ways, the child Pocahontas leads the way through this book. Her youth, her ability to move between cultures, and the way that that movement shaped both English and Indian destinies demonstrates the importance of children to the colonial enterprise. Her sad fate, and Americans' continued search for meaning in that fate, reveals how central the plight of

an endangered child was to colonial narratives seeking to make sense of the conflict and loss that accompanied colonization. Pocahontas's life, and the legend that this life has become, offers one template for how early American childhood becomes a material and symbolic repository for the emotional detritus of colonial conflict. The besieged body of a child functions in colonial and early republican America as an emotional centrifuge through which the horror of war, disease, and slavery are processed in a way that naturalizes the suffering of the vulnerable and the dependent as an inevitable byproduct of progress.

"Conceiving a Resemblance of Herself": The Threat of the Hybrid Child

For New England's Puritans, whose errand demanded excluding impure influences, the child's malleability — and thus its facility as a cultural go-between — was a site of both promise and threat. The fear that English children would absorb the ways of their native counterparts caused New Englanders to cast a wary eye on native childrearing practices and to attend to their own practices with additional rigor. In his famous sermon aboard the *Arabella*, John Winthrop draws on a long-standing metaphor of the body-as-community, instructing his listeners to act as one inseparable unit that integrates differences into harmonious function. Although "[t]here is no body, but consists in parts," he explains, the individual desires of these disparate aspects are subsumed by the fellow feeling "which knits those parts together." Such feeling "makes each part so contiguous to others as thereby they do mutually participate with each other, both in strength and infirmity, in pleasure and pain."[35] While proper Christian faith is, of course, necessary for inclusion in the social body Winthrop describes, outward signs of godliness do not function as criteria. Rather the proof lay in the inner states of the community's individual members. More specifically, communal functioning was dependent on members' feelings of sympathy with and for one another. Like many other theorists of sympathy, Winthrop assumes that the feeling arises from an awareness of a deep similitude between observer and observed. As he explains, affectionate sympathy arises from an "apprehension of some resemblance in things loved to that which affects it." According to Winthrop, "resemblance" is necessary for love and harmony to arise at all. Even God loves his creations in "so far it hath any of His image in it." Within

the individual households that make up a community, a mother "loves her child, because she thoroughly conceives a resemblance of herself in it."[36] The "ligaments" that bind Winthrop's social corpus, the bonds of sympathy that will keep the community solvent, were constituted by the desire to find oneself reflected in another.

Winthrop's conceit of a mother who loves a child because it mirrors her own image back to her resonates deeply throughout the New England colonial enterprise. From the earliest days of settlement, American Puritans looked to the child to reflect the future of their parents' errand. Surrounded by both people and a landscape that they considered rife with dangerous influences, early New Englanders were particularly invested in seeing their own authenticity and sense of purpose mirrored in their flourishing offspring. As Gillian Whitlock has observed, rearing children who would retain their parents' ethnic and national identities "assumed particular valency in settler colonies" like New England.[37] Yet during their time in the New World, the members of Winthrop's would-be commonwealth faced a disconcerting reality. The children who were supposed to affirm and perpetuate their elders' vision of godly piety and proper government would be inalterably changed by the native people and environment. Authorities — both civil and familial — would look in the faces of a growing population and find not their own righteousness reflected back to them, but a motley amalgamation of English and native, rendering the communal body rife with contamination. Because depictions of children in this era readily lent themselves to allegories of government while also tapping into the intense range of affect elicited by actual children within physical households — in short, because colonial children held an irredeemably messy position between divine expectations and material reality — I suggest that representations of such children often disrupted any number of binary divisions Puritan authors attempted to employ.

In his insightful essay "What's Colonial about Colonial America?" Michael Warner suggests that one reason early Americanists might be hesitant to draw extensively from postcolonial theory stems from a belief that American settlers were "able in general to ignore the context of dispossession. Unlike other white settlers in colonies such as Ulster or South Africa, white Americans did not leave in place a native majority to whom their colonial relations would be visibly troubling."[38] Certainly colonists of what would become the United States did much to eradicate the presence of na-

tive populations in North America, but as several scholars have illustrated, the presence of the "dispossessed" resonates powerfully throughout early American culture in ways we are still learning to recognize.

In an era where very little of the Indian's voice was committed to the written canon of New England, the recurring image of a child's besieged body occupies what poet Lola Lemire Tostavin might call a site of literary contamination — a space where "differences have been brought together so they make contact."[39] Often penned by men seeking to establish and maintain frameworks of colonial power, the trope of the suffering child in this early literature actually reveals how the complex network of exchange between the Indians, the English, and the American environment itself subtly shaped colonial representations of childhood. As Mary Louise Pratt has suggested, European "constructions of subordinated others has been shaped by those others, by the constructions of themselves and their habitats that they presented to the Europeans."[40] Contact with Indian conceptions of childrearing and family discipline influenced the ways New Englanders represented children, which in turn placed pressure on Old World models of authority contingent on a particular construction of a well-managed child.

Because the metaphor of the household-as-polity was foundational to seventeenth-century political thought, rhetorical relationships between parents and children were invariably entangled with evolving models of the relationship between governors and populations. Robert Filmer's *Patriacha*, published ten years after Winthrop's sermon, is perhaps the era's most famous defense of the long-standing hypothesis that equated fathers with rulers and children with subjects. Pulling from a biblical framework with which the Puritans were intimately familiar, Filmer insists that he "see[s] not how the children of Adam, or of any man else, can be free from subjection to their parents. And this subordination is the fountain of all regal authority, by the ordination of God himself."[41] John Dod and Robert Cleaver's oft-quoted text affirms this link between family and polity rendering a "household . . . a little commonwealth, by the good government whereof, God's glorie may be advanced, and the commonwealth which standeth of several families be benefited."[42] Winthrop's allusion to a mother and child bond that animates the larger social body reaffirms the long-standing model that equated the individual household with the larger community. The freedoms, as well as the dangers, attendant on settlement in the New World would

push colonists to consider familial analogies of governmental authority with increasingly anxious attention.

Enmeshed with the ideological framework that invested childrearing in the New World with governmental implications, contemporary beliefs about the body rendered the child's physical welfare a vital source of information about how the English would fare in the American environment itself. Theorists like Frantz Fanon have focused on the ways colonial power can inscribe the body of the native as inalterably Other and inferior, but in the early American colonial period physical boundaries were still relatively malleable. As Karen Kupperman and other historians have noted, early moderns envisioned a reciprocal relationship with their environment: like an uprooted plant, an individual could expect to be transformed, enhanced, or perhaps even destroyed, depending on what soil they found themselves in.[43] In his tract "Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians," John Eliot emphasizes the fluidity of exchange between environment and individual by conflating the Indians with the land they occupy:

> [B]ut me thinkes now that it is with the Indians as it was with our New-English ground when we first came over, there was scarce any man that could beleeve that English graine would grow, or that the Plow could do any good in this woody and rocky soile. And thus they continued in this supine unbelief until experience taught them otherwise, and all see it to bee scarce inferior to Old English tillage, but beares very good burderns: so wee have thought of our Indian people, and therefore have been discouraged to put plow to such dry and rocky ground, but God having begun thus with some few it may bee they are better soile for the Gospel than wee can thinke.[44]

Both the land and its inhabitants might have been initially resistant, but, Eliot insists, they proved ultimately pliable and receptive to outside influence. The child's body, by definition a work in progress, intensifies this sense of openness to environmental influences. Children — to extend Eliot's metaphor — provided particularly fertile ground for cultural transformation. Later in the same tract, Eliot writes that his missionary efforts consisted largely of catechizing "the younger sort of Indian children."[45] Even Thomas Morton of Merry Mount fame (a man possessing decidedly less evangelical zeal than Eliot) takes on the responsibility of "educating" an Indian child in Christian ways. In *New English Canaan*, Morton relates that an Indian man named Wampas requests "that I would let his sonne be brought up

in my howse, that hee might be taught to reade in that booke [the Bible]." Once Morton tells the father that he will take in his son, Wampas is "a very joyfull man to thinke, that his sonne should thereby (as hee said) become an Englishman; and then he would become a good man."[46]

Yet the promise of remaking Native American children into Englishmen also carried with it a palpable threat. If it were possible for Morton's Indian protégé to become an "Englishman" through extended exposure to English culture, it would also be possible for the process to work in reverse. In the logic of climatology, the supposed "savagery" of the native people was largely attributable to the detrimental influences of the American landscape. Arguably, the first generation of English children born into such an environment could well grow up just as wild as their neighbors. Instead of mirroring their parents' essence back to them, the children of New England might well reflect elements of the very "howling wilderness" that the Puritans felt God wanted them to conquer. As unstable subjects who, to paraphrase Homi Bhabha, are almost the same as their English parents but not quite, the English children in these texts bridge the gap between the "divinely" ordained authority of the Puritans and the rebellion and chaos they associated with the native population.[47] Acting as the physical reproductions of English Puritanism, and as points vulnerable to invasion and corruption by their surroundings, children in early New England evoke and transform Bhabha's conception of the colonial hybrid who allow "other 'denied' knowledges to enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority — its rules of recognition."[48] Whereas Bhabha's model largely focuses how colonized populations warp and refract the supposed authenticity and originality of the colonizing culture, I suggest that, in these texts, the threat of hybridity also emanates from the homes of the colonizers themselves.

The Journal of John Winthrop and Providential Childrearing

In *The Journal of John Winthrop*, Governor Winthrop continually looks to the child to reflect God's investment in the colony — and, by extension, its rulers — only to have the material circumstances of colonial childhood estrange his typology. Certainly, there are several passages where Winthrop finds evidence of God's approval and investment in the coming generation of the faithful. In 1633 for instance, God is credited with saving "two little girls of the governor's family" from a grisly fate. The governor explains that

the girls "were sitting under a great heap of logs," when Mrs. Winthrop told them to move. Remarkably, Winthrop relates, "they were no sooner gone but the whole heap of logs fell down in the place and had crushed them to death if the Lord in his special providence had not delivered them."[49] Children who aren't on the right side of the Lord's favor are not quite so lucky. In 1634, Winthrop reports that "such of the Indian children as were left [after a smallpox epidemic] were taken by the English" but most of them "did die of the pox soon after; 3 only remaining."[50] Later Winthrop seems to find evidence for the precarious spiritual state of these surviving Indian children in the physical distress they display in Puritan homes, where they are continually "frightened with Hobbamock (as they call the devil) appearing to them in divers shapes."[51] As I will discuss in my analysis of the Salem witch trials, the Indian belief that children could easily be visited by the spirit world, manifest here in Winthrop's reporting, would also emerge in the judges' credulity toward the afflicted English children of Salem.

But as much as the governor might have liked to keep his tales of children within the neat boundaries suggested by these two stories, in which God saves the Puritans and the Devil takes the Indians, the children he turns to for material defy such easy categorization. Although Winthrop looks to suffering children to reinforce God's endorsement of Puritan authority over the American wilderness, the broken bodies that litter his textual landscape offer a substantial critique of the authority figures who leave them vulnerable to harm. Bound by his own implicit formulation of the child as emblem of the young colony, when Winthrop confronts injured and suffering children, he has little choice but to render their pain a rebuke for a mismanaged colonial errand. The wounds that Winthrop describes represent numerous points of invasion and corruption that render the colony unfit for God's continued advocacy. In March of 1638, Winthrop depicts the dangers of contamination in the form of an English infant whose grotesquely malformed body enacts the horrors attending the entrance of ungodly influences into a Puritan home. The baby is apparently punished for the sins of its parents, "both of them notoriously infected with Mrs. Hutchinson's errors."[52] The child is stillborn, and according to Winthrop's description, a terrifying hybrid of human and demon. As if frozen in mid-metamorphosis from one form to another, this child "had a face, but no head . . . over the eyes four horns, hard and sharp . . . all over the breast and back full of sharp pricks and scales like a thornback."[53] For Winthrop, this nightmarish child, like

the miscarriage of Anne Hutchinson herself, embodies the disease lying dormant in the Puritan community, needing only the touch of "infection" to become manifest in the colonial social body.

The line between the well-knit social body Winthrop envisions in his sermon and the exterior forces that seek to injure and violate it becomes even more indistinguishable in a later entry. On November 12, 1641, Winthrop reveals that two little girls were sexually molested by two local men, Daniel Fairfield and his servant John Hudson. Winthrop is quite explicit in his discussion, relating that the girls "were by him [Fairfield] abused very often, especially on the Lord's days and lecture days, by agitation and effusion of seed, and after by entering the body of the elder."[54] The circumstances surrounding these injured children disallow reading their pain as the product of heretics or savages; the evidence damns fellow colonists who should bear the imprimatur of divine authority. Yet, although it is a sign that critiques the authority adults have over children, this incident — as Winthrop's decision to include it would seem to suggest — was a sign nonetheless. The violated bodies of these girls, like the preserved bodies of Winthrop's own daughters, are texts on which the colony can read their current relationship with Providence. That relationship could only be read as deeply troubled. Two men who have no regard for the Lord's Day and lecture days pose an irreconcilable threat to Winthrop's model of a community knit together by sympathy and similitude. Here that threat becomes literalized in the violated bodies of two little girls.

The symbolic resonance of children's bodies in a colonial context lent even more weight to the Calvinistic emphasis on parents' need to restrict and control unpredictable sons and daughters. According to John Robinson, a contemporary and friend of William Bradford, "[t]here is in all children, though not all alike, a stubbornness, and stoutness of mind arising from natural pride, that must in the first place, be broken and beaten down."[55] Such severity is necessary because "the fruit of naturall corruption and root of actual rebellion against both God and man must be destroyed, and no manner of way nourished."[56] At least in many of the narratives that Puritans chose to tell themselves about raising children, an uncorrected child represents a dire threat to the divinely ordained order of home and, by extension, civil authority. By contrast, a well-ordered home enacted God's intended harmony between father and governor.

Given the alignment of obedient children and divine order, it is hardly

surprising that Puritans found the gentler childrearing strategies of neighboring Indian tribes indicative of a lack of civilization. As several historians have documented, northeastern tribes tended to engage in nonauthoritarian relationships with their children, often relying on praise rather than corporeal punishment to encourage proper behavior.[57] As historian Karen Ordhal Kupperman writes, "The Americans were universally described as affectionate parents."[58] Pierre de Charlevoix, writing in the eighteenth century in New France, comments on the remarkable closeness between parents and children: "They never leave them, they carry about them every where with them; even when they are ready to sink under the burthen with which they load themselves."[59]

The "burthen" which Indian parents took on was emotional as well as physical. English observers were particularly struck with the emotional investment parents had in their children. For a people schooled in stoic resignation to God's will, the extravagant grief of a native parent for a lost child must have been a deeply uncomfortable thing to witness. As Mitchell Breitweiser's sophisticated analyses of grief in Mary Rowlandson's narrative attests, one need not go far to gather evidence that the Puritan imperative to contain grief over a lost child was not an easy edict to obey. The poems of Anne Bradstreet often center on the problem of reining in maternal grief so that she might align herself within the emotional boundaries of a godly woman. One 1678 poem, "In Memory of My Dear Grandchild — Elizabeth Bradstreet, Who Deceased August, 1665, Being a Year and a Half Old," moves from detailing the great love and attendant loss she felt for the child to a resolution that asserts the inevitability — if not the justice — of divine will.

> Farewell, dear babe, my heart's too much content
> Farewell, sweet babe, the pleasure of mine eye?
> Farewell, fair flower that for a space was lent,
> Then taken away unto eternity!
> Blest babe, why should I once bewail thy fate,
> Or sigh the days so soon were terminate,
> Since thou art settled in an everlasting state?[60]

Many of Bradstreet's poems give voice to the desire to express unrestrained grief, to "bewail the fate" of a "sweet babe" lost forever, a desire that must ultimately yield to the resignation required by Puritan doctrine, and I would

suggest, by the demands of the colonial environment.[61] Faced with native parents who grieved openly and passionately, English settlers likely felt cultural, as well as religious, pressure to keep their own expressions of mourning within "civilized" bounds.

William Wood, for one, was struck by the terrible anguish Indians expressed at the loss of a loved one, noting "their grief-wrung hands, and tear-bedewed cheeks, [and] their doefull cries."[62] Roger Williams, writing in *A Key into the Language of America*, focuses specifically on the death of a child and is struck with the depth and expression of the Indians' grief: "their [the Indians'] affection to their children, are very strong; so that I have knowne a *Father* take so grievously the losse of his childe, that hee hath cut and stob'd himself with grief and rage."[63] For the Puritans, after all, to mourn excessively was to quarrel with Providence. The Indians' strong expressions of mourning were further evidence of their heathen ways.

In addition to the dangers of what Puritans would view as excessive mourning for dead children, expressing too much fondness for live children was also a dangerous endeavor. Indeed, according to John Robinson, too much love would lead to the loss of that child. When speaking of a favorite child he warns that "sometimes the Lord takes away such before the rest to punish the father's fondness."[64] If parents do not want to lose their children through death, the argument runs, they must not become too attached to them in life. Dod and Cleaver, while acknowledging the inevitability of parental love, admonish parents to keep their affections a secret. "Wisdome requireth," they argue, "that [parents] somewhat dissemble and hide their love (especially to those children that be of some reasonable discretion) lest they take boldnesse thereupon to do what they list."[65] When confronted with a more indulgent model of parent-child relations presented by the Narragansett, Roger Williams strongly criticizes what he considers lax paternal authority. He relates a story where a father asks his eight-year-old boy to get water, and the child refuses. Williams, taken aback by the child's insolence, "told the father I would correct my child, if he should so disobey me."[66] The father tries to comply with Williams's advice, taking up a stick to beat his son, but the boy, who wasn't trained to submit to such punishment, picks up a stick and seems to give as good as he gets. After the battle is completed, Williams reasserts the superiority of English discipline, relating that the "poore father . . . confessed the benefit of correction and the evill of their too indulgent affections."[67] Although the *Key* relates several examples

of cultural difference, nowhere does Williams seem as distressed as when he witnesses a father overruled by his own son.

New England's First Fruits, an anonymous tract published the same year as Williams's, aligns rebellious children with all of native culture. Clearly, the author feels that both need extensive correction:

> We confessed it was true that wee had all but one father, but after that our first father fell, hee had divers children some were bad and some good, those that were bad would not take his counsell but departed from him and from God, and those God left alone in sinne and ignorance, but others did regard him and the counsel of God by him, and those knew God, and so the difference arose at first, that some together with their posterity knew God, and others did not; and so we told them it was at this day, for like as if an old man an aged father amongst them have many children, if some bee rebellious against the counsell of the father, he shuts them out of doores, and lets them goe, and regard them not, unles they return and repent, but others that will bee ruled by him, they learne by him and come to now his mind.[68]

According to this account, the differences occasioned by geography, culture, and ethnicity were merely the residual effects of an initial split caused by parental indulgence and the disobedience that resulted. In 1647, John Eliot also draws on the image of a rebellious child when speaking of the Indians' relationship to God. When an old man asks if it is too late for him to repent, Eliot comforts him by telling that "if a father had a sonne that had beene disobedient many yeares," if that son finally repents, "his father is so mercifull that hee wil readily forgive him and love him." Since "God is a more mercifull father to those whom he hath made, then any father can bee to his rebellious childe whom he hath begot," the man needn't worry.[69] Arguably, God would forgive all the Indians if they would only submit to the authority invested in Puritan ministers.

In attempts to erect clear cultural boundaries, the points of crossover are fraught with both fear and desire. The rhetoric of Puritan ministers and authors insists that stern discipline is essential to saving children's souls (not to mention their English identity). Yet Linda Pollack's *Forgotten Children* reminds us that childrearing manuals are not always the best indicator of how children were actually being raised. In diaries of English settlers, she finds evidence of parents who, while almost certainly aware of the imperative to be strict with their children, found themselves emotionally unequal

to the task. Oliver Haywood, for one, cannot stick to the model of an Old Testament father when faced with his children's tears. "[O]n Saturday morning," he wrote, "my sons having not made their latin in expectation to goe to Halifax, were loath to goe to schoole, yet I threatened them." So far, so good. The children will likely learn a harsh lesson about the consequences of skipping their homework, and will come home more dutiful sons. But Haywood relates, as the boys "went crying, my bowels workt and I sent to call them back."[70] In this case, the father's powerful emotions emerge as a fault. The physical grip of empathy for his crying children subverts the lessons of control and consequences he "should" have been teaching them.

When Puritan children failed to meet the standards of proper obedience and submission (as children are wont to do), they disrupted the symbolic economy that helped to separate and order English relations with the Indians. For, according to the binary logic that generates so much of Puritan cosmology, if Indians are outcast because they are rebellious children, then *any* rebellious child bears a perilous resemblance to the outcast and dangerous Indians. And there was abundant evidence that English children were indeed straying from the path of their parents. As James Axtell and James Demos have illustrated, it was not unheard of for captive English children to prefer the Indian lifestyle to the "New England Way."[71] Within the Puritan community, the necessity of instituting the 1662 "Halfway Covenant" loosening church controls over baptism acknowledged that the children of the first generation were falling short of the piety of their fathers.

Indian Captivity and the Rebellious Child in Early New England

In 1676, Increase Mather worries that the desolation of King Philip's War was the product of increasingly "Indianized" children. He begins by reiterating the standard description of Indian children as disobedient and rebellious: "The fifth commandment is one of the great and National Sins which the Indians are guilty of: their children have no reverence toward their fathers." Apparently, Mather warns, this "national" sin is infecting the English families who share the environment with these insubordinate Indians. Acting within a remarkably compact symbolic economy, God afflicts the Puritans with the very instrument that has tempted them to behave like rebellious infidels. "If we learn the way of the Heathen and become like them," Mather warns, "God will punish us by them. And it is to me a

sad and solemn thought that this Miserable War, hath been raised and fomented by proud and vain young men." This transmission of Indian traits to English children, if unchecked, will soon render the Christian settlement indistinguishable from the "Heathen" land it sought to civilize. "I pray the Lord," Mather writes, "that ungoverned young men in Families and Societies may not prove the ruine of New-England."[72]

This pressing anxiety about English children absorbing — and perhaps, transmitting — native traits to the colonists manifests in two striking communal representations of childhood suffering: the Salem/Essex witch crisis and the captivity narrative. Both of these stories, told with a spectacularly agonized child at its center, have gone on to become touchstones in literary and historical narratives of early America. Both the depictions of Indian captivity and the transcripts of the Salem witch trials hinge on traumatic representations of children, and the pull on adult emotions that witnessing such childhood suffering occasioned. In both the stories surrounding captivity and the witch trials, the figure of a child's afflicted body takes center stage, providing the meaning that colonial adults were charged with unpacking. In other words, two literary springboards in early American culture — the stories of Indian captivity, and the story of Salem in 1692 — achieve their emotional force through glossing a child's suffering body, reading it as a text that explicates the boundaries between Indian and English. In the process, these readings of the child victim map a new, potentially treacherous, emotional terrain.

As a collector and editor of many narratives of Indian captivity, and as an observer and chronicler of the Salem witch trials, Cotton Mather was deeply invested in policing the boundaries of the "little commonwealth" and paid particular attention to the problem of disobedient children. In a late seventeenth-century sermon titled "A Family Well-Ordered," Mather insists that rebelling against one's father figure was tantamount to throwing off the yoke of divine authority. "Can you dream," he demands, "that God will allow any Contempt of Political Parents, of Ecclesiastical, or of Scholastical?"[73] Apparently not, for according to Mather, God inflicts an astonishing variety of retributions on the body of an insubordinate child. In the same sermon, Mather uses a biblical story to evoke terrifying images of mutilation and death that await the disobedient son or daughter: "It is a memorable passage, in Prov 30:17: The Eye that mocks at his Father and despises to obey his Mother, the Ravens of the Valley shall pick it out, and the young Eagles

shall eat it. It seems, an untimely death often Exposes the Carcasses of those Children, to the Carnivorous Fowls of Heaven."[74] Held up as an emblem of God's wrath to a potentially errant populace, the child here reinforces a narrative of control that allows Mather to separate the righteous from the ungodly. Abandoned, tortured, and mutilated, the body of the child is purged of the disobedient and rebellious impulses that threaten both the Puritan home and the community.

When Mather draws on the image of suffering childhood in captivity, however, the complex intercultural framework into which these rhetorical children are placed generates a far more complicated reading than the rebuked boy depicted in the sermon. At first glance, the parallels between the two genres are striking. Both narrative and sermon use religious rhetoric to frame the story of an unassailable authority meting out punishment to weak and helpless subjects. And in both sermon and narrative, the scriptural emphasis on God the father allows the speaker to smoothly compare earthly and heavenly families.

In addition to the paternal framework provided by scripture, the nature of captivity itself cannot help but evoke metaphors of childhood. Several scholars have elucidated the feminization of captivity in Puritan narratives, but alongside considerations of gender, we also need to examine the ways the protagonists are infantilized — a position adjacent to womanhood, but certainly not identical.[75] Even when the protagonist in these tales is an adult, the captivity narrative is always, on some level, reenacting the confrontation between the rigid father figure and the rebellious, but overpowered, child Mather depicts in his sermon. Utterly helpless, dependent on the whims of caretakers whose language and motivations are largely incomprehensible, the captive's position articulates the vulnerability of childhood. In 1656, Thomas Hooker writes that "in infancy a man lives little more than the life of a Plant or Beast, feeding and sleeping, growing and increasing."[76] In captivity, the victim is reduced to an infantile fascination with bodily needs. Mary Rowlandson's 1682 narrative, for example, deals obsessively with the difficulty of securing food and rest. In the few pages it takes to describe the seventh and eighth "removes," Rowlandson mentions thirteen different kinds of food, ranging from corn to peas to half-cooked horse liver.[77] If a captive expected to survive her ordeal, she had to reinvent herself in the role of a child who could wring the necessities of food and shelter from her new masters.

In opposition to the enforced childhood of the captive, the native captor emerges as caretaker. And, according to these early captivity narratives, not only do Algonquian captors provide food and shelter, they also supplant Puritan parents as protectors and disciplinarians. In striking opposition to the standard colonial assessments of the Indians as overly gentle parents, the captors in these tales — much like the fathers lauded in Williams's narrative and Mather's sermon — insist on complete obedience, and are willing to go to extreme measures to insure it. The 1702 edition of Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* tells of a young girl named Mary Ferguson who indulges in an emotional outburst and, significantly, interjects her own will into the captive-captor relationship, "telling her Indian master that she could go no further."[78] Her captor promptly kills her, and tells the other captives that they will meet the same end "if they were not patient."[79] Ironically, in his need to depict the Indians as cruel and savage, Mather is forced to emphasize behavior that deviates from the indulgent childrearing strategy Puritans usually attributed to native families. In a moment that collapses the distance between authority and subject, Mather portrays Indians mimicking stalwart Puritan parents who demand unyielding obedience and decry overt affection or emotion. As Indian captors reflect Puritan ideals of family order, the supposedly sacrosanct dyad of punishing father and recalcitrant child "returns as the displacing gaze of the disciplined."[80] Through the refractory lens of the captivity narrative, the normalizing Puritan concept of a pious disciplinarian father returns as the arbitrary despotism of a godless savage.

In another selection from the *Magnalia*, "New Assaults from the Indians," the distance between punishing father and Indian tormentor is explicitly collapsed, as Mather depicts a tortured boy strikingly reminiscent of the disobedient child featured in his own "Family Well-Ordered" sermon. The birds of prey that destroy the eyes of an insubordinate child in the sermon are simply replaced with the cruelty of an Indian in the captivity narrative. The child unwittingly begins his trial by "lamenting with tears the want of his parents." Under the rubric of obedience and submission that orders the Puritan household — and by extension Puritan society — the child should remain silently resigned to his fate. Yet the boy continues to cry, and although Mather tells us that the Indians threaten the youngster, they are unable to "extinguish the natural affections of a child." The story then relates that the captors are infuriated by their failure to subdue the child, and proceed to strip and beat the boy:[81]

> And when he was tired with laying on his blows on the forlorn infant, he would lay him on the ground with taunts, remembering him of his parents. In this misery the poor creature lay horribly roaring for divers days together while his master, gratified with the music, lay contriving of new torments wherewith to martyr him. It was not long before the child had a sore eye, which his master said proceeded from his weeping on the forbidden accounts. Whereupon, laying hold on the head of the child with his left hand, with the thumb of his right he forced the ball of his eye quite out, therewithal when he heard him he would serve the other too and leave him never an eye to weep withal.[82]

Recall that in his "Family Well-Ordered" sermon (published in 1699, the same year Mather publishes a shorter version of the above narrative in his *Decennium Luctuosum*), Mather draws on the image of a biblical child whose eye is plucked out by ravens because the boy "mocks at his Father and despises to obey his Mother." Ostensibly, because God inflicts such suffering on this child, the wretch must deserve his fate. In the captivity narrative however, Mather directs the reader's affective energy toward the suffering and mutilated child and against the disciplinarian and instrument of his pain. In this scenario, the hand that holds the chastening rod not only invites, but actually *deserves*, the defiant rage of the victim suffering beneath the blows. Simultaneously acting as the dangerously rebellious subject who threatens authority and the afflicted martyr who activates the split between civilized and savage, the child both demands the reader's sympathy as a fellow colonist beset by savages, and embodies the perceived chaos of rebellious Indian childhood that engenders just such "savagery." After all, the child is being punished because he refuses to submit to adult authority. In this moment of transcultural exchange, the denial of the child victim who rebels against God the father emerges as the hero of a story intended to reaffirm the patriarchal order of colonial authority.

We do not have access to the words of either of these children or of their Indian captors, testimony that would certainly complicate, and perhaps refute, Mather's version of events. But a critical focus on the children for whom Mather attempts to speak can yield faint echoes of the many dissonant voices he tries so hard to suppress. For the Indian captors are not the only characters transformed in these narratives. In order to maintain the opposition vital to the stories of colonial order and cultural purity, the

rhetoric of the captivity narrative prompts New Englanders to reconsider their own story of childhood. If the supposedly evil Indian captors demand complete obedience and insist on emotional distance, then the Puritans, as their antithesis, are pushed, if only imaginatively, to espouse the more flexible and indulgent approach to children they have so disdained in the Indians. Rather than creating a narrative that proves the need to submit to proper authority, Mather opens a space where readers can revel vicariously in the rebellion of an unjustly punished child and feel sympathy for his pain. In his attempt to figure children as a site that reaffirms Puritan opposition to everything Indian, Mather actually allows for a critique of Puritan discipline made possible, in part, by the proximity and influence of Indian childrearing customs.

"Why Doe You Hurt These Children?": The Specter of Childhood Affliction in 1692 Salem

The changing emotional investment in the stakes of childhood that were articulated in Cotton Mather's turn-of-the-century writings about suffering children in Indian captivity provide a key context for understanding the events that unfolded in Salem in 1692. At the time that Mather was collecting tales of captivity, Salem villagers were engaging in their own spectacle of suffering childhood. As the work of generations of historians can attest, the reasons for the Salem crisis are complex and manifold. Whether one attributes the cause behind the 1692 hysteria to squabbling neighbors, spiritual degeneration, or psychedelic crops, the hysteria, once unleashed, played out as a communal reading of suffering children's bodies.[83] In defiance of long-standing precedent in law and theology, the core group of accusers included several girls under the age of twelve whose uncorroborated testimony was accepted as the primary evidence for conviction. Those girls were put on public display as their physical distress provided both testimony and evidence of the workings of the invisible world. The remarkable series of events unleashed by a group of suffering children in 1692 was one legacy of the colonial encounters that had reshaped beliefs about what children were, what they were capable of, and what adults should do in response to childhood suffering.

The Salem witch trials are often considered the death knell of Puritan hegemony. The trials, Perry Miller wrote, "nearly wrecked" the foundational

Figure 3. *Tituba and the Children*, by A. Fredericks. From *A Popular History of the United States*, volume 2, by William Cullen Bryant (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1878), 457.

Puritan belief in the covenant.[84] As the trials progressed, basic signposts for understanding the world became scrambled, as churchgoing matriarchs became Satan's consorts, and meek young girls, orphans, and slaves became authorities on the supernatural. Mary Beth Norton, Elaine Breslaw, and Nancy Ruttenberg have all noted the striking gender and status reversals the trials initiated. The core group of accusers — female children and young girls — was actually the least likely segment of the community to garner serious attention. Young girls, teenagers, and servants, whose role was to be silent and deferential, suddenly had great power over the lives of respectable town members. One reason this particular staging of the girls' suffering was able to take on the power and meaning it did was that frontier violence had raised the emotional stakes of childhood itself.

Although not all the afflicted in Salem were children, the affair began with young girls, and as the language of the trials asserts, suffering children

occupied center stage, both in the questions the judges asked, and in the drama that surrounded the questioning. Betty Parris, age nine, began acting strangely in January of 1692. Soon Abigail Williams, who was approximately twelve years old, also became afflicted. By late February, Ann Putnam, age twelve or thirteen, and Betty Hubbard, seventeen, also insisted that they were suffering the effects of witchcraft.[85] Although this core group of initial afflicted accusers would later be joined by adults — and as Norton and others argue, adult support was essential to moving the investigation through formal channels — the suffering children were the affective center of the trials' rhetoric and action until the end. No matter how many adults were crying out, the judges continually pointed to the children as the centerpiece of affect.

Judge Hathorne used the children as rhetorical and emotional props to expose the hidden interior of Sarah Good, one of the first to be accused of witchcraft. As the trial began, Hathorne asked Good, "[W]hy doe you hurt these children?" Good insisted that she did not, and that she was falsely accused. Hathorne then "desired the children, all of them, to look upon her, and see, if this were the person that had hurt them." The transcript tells us that, on cue, "they all did looke upon her and said this was one of the persons that did torment them — presently they were all tormented." Emboldened by their spectacular suffering, Hathorne again turned to the accused: "Sarah Good," he intoned, "doe you not see now what you have done[?]" The performance of suffering, for him, is sufficient evidence that the children were indeed being hurt. "[W]hy," he asks of Good, "doe you not tell us the truth, why doe you thus torment these poor children?" As in the captivity narrative, the act of tormenting a "poor child" had become the emotional centerpiece in tales of colonial conflict.[86]

As Deodat Lawson attests, by the time that Martha Corey was examined, there were ten afflicted people in the village, three of whom were girls under twelve, and four of whom were young women, or maids. The other three were adults. Yet during the examination, the afflicted who most concerned both the judge and Corey were the children. Early in the examination, Hathorne asks Corey, "Tell us who hurts these children."[87] She responds that she did not afflict them. Later, an afflicted person named simply as "child" insists "there is a man whispering in her [Corey's] ear." The questioning continues amid the "Extream agony of all the afflicted." This emphasis

on children — and children's suffering — reverberates throughout the trials even as more adults join the fray.

The immediate precedents to Salem reveal how the role of the child victim took on unique dimensions in Salem as children's voices, as well as their pain, were credited as sufficient evidence to convict and execute. It was not unusual that Salem's troubles began with a suffering child — many of the previous witchcraft investigations in New England and in Europe began because a child was behaving strangely. What was unusual in Salem was the credence that met the children's voices, and the "spectral evidence" about which those voices testified. As Mary Beth Norton has documented, from "the late sixteenth century on, portrayals of young people's behavior 'in their fits' had long been associated with diabolical activity." The Hartford witch trials — an event that, as Walt Woodward has argued, anticipates Salem's hysteria and ferocity — began with the death of an eight-year-old girl, whose last words accused one Goody Ayres of choking her. The accusation set off a year-long frenzy, with eight trials taking place in eight months. Accused witches were subjected to the water test, wherein they were bound and dropped into a body of water. If they rose to the surface, it was considered proof of guilt. Four people were executed before John Winthrop Jr. effectively put a stop to the trials.[88]

The Bury St. Edmunds trial in England, another precedent for Salem, involved seven children and teenagers who accused two widows of bewitching them. Although at least two of the children were permitted in the courtroom, the overwhelming amount of testimony came from parents speaking on behalf of a child who had suffered at some point in the past. Notably, the only lengthy spoken testimony given by the afflicted came after the witches had been convicted.[89] There is, however, one moment that anticipates the performative testimony the Salem children will provide. The judge ordered an accused witch to touch the hand of the afflicted children. Before the witch's touch, the afflicted were apparently "wholly deprived of all sense and understanding." Yet "the least touch of one of these supposed Witches Rose Cullender by Name," caused the afflicted to "shriek out."[90] Here the afflicted's physical suffering supplied the independent "proof" that Hartford judges would seek in the water test. Later, the afflicted were blindfolded yet again, and were touched by a neutral person. Their reaction was exactly the same. Although many in the room found this mistake damning evidence that "this

whole business was a meer Imposture," the children's initial responses were taken as credible evidence.[91]

Cotton Mather took particular note of this trial, and discussed the doubt surrounding the reliability of this touch test. In the end, however, a belief in the child's transparent emotional state carried the day. Even though the blindfolded victims responded just as violently to a randomly chosen person as they had to the accused witch, officials decided that the discrepancy was actually proof that "the Parties were really Bewitched, than otherwise: for they say that is not possible that any should counterfeit such Distempers, being accompanied by such various Circumstances, much less Children and for so long [a] time and yet undiscovered by their Parents and Relations."[92] Mather reiterates this argument in his 1689 *Memorable Providences*, when he considers the children's perfect transparency a pillar of evidence: "In a word, Such was the whole Temper and Carriage of the Children, that there cannot easily be any thing more unreasonable, than to imagine that a Design to Dissemble could cause them to fall into any of their odd Fits."[93] Here the admittedly problematic performances of young girls are accepted precisely because the girls are children. Thus even when the child's testimony seemed to some observers "a farce," the meanings a suffering child had accrued rendered the visible pain of a child unassailable — at least to Cotton Mather. Mather's interest in the children's transparent nature at Bury St. Edmunds should come as no surprise, given his intense interest in the fate of children who were incapable of hiding their emotions during Indian captivity.

This belief in the child's inability to "counterfeit" — made manifest in New England's portrayals of the tragic fates of captive white children who could not hide their distress — takes on great power in the context of Essex County's great anxiety about Indian warfare. When Judge Hathorne decided to place the children in the courtroom, he greatly intensified the dynamic initiated in the Bury St. Edmunds trial. Whereas in Bury St. Edmunds the children were largely spoken for by their parents, in Salem the afflicted girls literally held center stage, offering real-time glimpses into the dark recesses of the invisible world they seemingly inhabited. In so doing, the magistrates made the children's suffering, and their voices, the force that moved the proceedings forward.[94]

The degree to which children's voices were credited in Salem speaks to the emotional volatility attached to the figure of a suffering child, and illustrates how that volatility could disrupt traditional practices. The clash

between two vying models of childhood emerges in one pointed exchange between Judge Hathorne and the accused Corey. After Hathorne had pointed to the children's visible distress, and cited their description of the pain as credible testimony, Corey sought to undermine the evidence based on the girls' ages with an appeal to the irrationality of youth. Corey turned to the judge, pleading, "We must not believe all that these distracted children say."[95] Corey's point was, in fact, more in line with evolving legal theory. As Holly Brewer contends, and as I discuss at greater length in chapter 3, the eighteenth century would see a decided, if slow-moving, shift in children's supposed ability to consent in a legal sense. Hale's *Pleas of the Crown* (1678) made the increasingly influential argument that children's testimony could not be trusted, and the changes Hale urged were adopted slowly and intermittently over the next century.[96] By the late seventeenth century, restrictions on child marriage had slowly begun to solidify, on the basis that a very young child's word could not count in a legal contract.[97] It was these newly emerging doubts about children's consensual capacities — doubts that legal scholars would first begin to acknowledge in the late seventeenth century, and widely adopt by the end of the eighteenth — that Goodwife Corey desperately sought to exploit. Yet it was Hathorne's investment in crediting the girls' "extream agonies" that would dominate the proceedings. Salem would remain firmly within the older legal model that allowed children to testify, particularly as victims of crimes. Indeed, Salem went several steps further. These children were given so much credence that normally discredited "spectral testimony" would become damning evidence.

Returning to the role of the child victim in the Indian captivity narrative can, I suggest, illuminate the remarkable power of the afflicted children in Salem. As Mary Beth Norton has masterfully demonstrated, many of those involved in the Salem crisis had been personally touched by recent raids on the Maine frontier, and therefore had a particularly intense relationship with the threat of captivity, torture, and mutilation.[98] Gossip was a powerful means of communication on the frontier, and the stories of captives taken in King Philip's War, some of which Cotton Mather would publish in 1702 (the same year that the Reverend John Hale would publish his *A Modest Enquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft*), would have certainly been familiar to Salem residents, if only by rumor. The residents would likely have been deeply affected by the gruesome acts of torture and mutilation that such tales contained, and caught up in the call to sympathy for the victims that

would establish them as purveyors of Christian civility. As I have argued, descriptions of Indian warfare often contrasted the emotional response of the English to highlight the merciless nature of the enemy.

In a 1692 account of the attack on York, for instance, the Reverend George Burroughs (who would later himself be executed for witchcraft) writes that the "merciless flames, the insultations of the heathen enemy, shooting, hacking (not having regard to the earnest supplication of men, women or Children, with sharpe eyes & bitter tears in most humble manner) [was] most affecting the heart."[99] The implication, of course, was that the Indians lacked the hearts to be affected. Mary Rowlandson's 1682 account of her captivity with the Wampanoags also drew clear lines of distinction between the English captives' emotional pain and the stoic indifference of the captives. Taking note of the physical and emotional wounds she had endured, Rowlandson laments having to leave with "those barbarous creatures, with our bodies wounded and bleeding, and our hearts no less than our bodies."[100] The natives, here as in Burroughs's account, are unmoved by the pitiful states of the captives, which include Rowlandson's young daughter.

The lack of sympathy attributed to the Indians in captivity narratives facilitates their evil doings. Later in the narrative, Rowlandson explicitly describes her Wampanoag captors as devils: "This was the dolefulest night that ever my eyes saw. Oh the roaring, and singing and dancing, and yelling of those black creatures in the night, which made the place a lively resemblance of hell."[101] As Norton has noted, "the black man" is a prominent feature in the accounts of Salem's afflicted, rhetorically linking the "tawny" Indians with traditional images of Satan. Considering how extensively the Indians had been aligned with the devil, it is striking how closely Satan's predations on the young girls in the Parris household mimicked the aggressions of Indian captors. "Sometimes," the Reverend John Hale wrote, "they [the girls] were taken dumb, their mouths stopped, their throats choaked, their limbs wracked and tormented so as might move a heart of stone, to sympathize with them, with bowels of compassion for them."[102] Much like the Indian captors Cotton Mather would describe during this same period, Satan seems particularly invested in keeping children quiet. To be clear, other witch scares also featured silenced children — Salem's afflicted children were not unique. But in a town rife with fear of Indian captivity and torture, these "choaked" children would evoke a new and terrifying set of

associations that would simply not have registered in the same way at Bury St. Edmunds.

Perhaps to set themselves in opposition to an enemy who wanted to silence children (not in itself, as I have noted, a stance Puritans would criticize) the people of Essex County, Massachusetts, seemed particularly obliged to allow the children to speak out — often in shocking ways — and to attend their words with respect. As Mary Beth Norton declares, "the male heads of [the girls'] households and other adult men of their families gave them hours of attention, probably for the first time in their lives," as they scrupulously took notes during the girls "fits."[103] Along with this attention came a tacit tolerance, if not endorsement, of the sort of insubordinate, rebellious behavior that severely tested the Puritan investment in hierarchical authority so often articulated through parent-child metaphors. Deodat Lawson describes how the afflicted girls "did something interrupt" him during Sunday meeting on March 20, 1692. Under normal circumstances, no congregant, much less a female child, would feel authorized to interrupt the speech of a minister.[104] If she did, her impertinence would have been surely and quickly corrected. Yet on March 20, Abigail Williams scandalously insisted that Lawson "stand up, and Name [his] Text." It is tempting to imagine that Williams spoke for many a bored child in the congregation when, after hearing Lawson's dutiful response about his chosen text for the day, she declared, "It is a long text." In the afternoon service, Williams's interventions became still more openly critical. "I know no Doctrine you had," she told the minister in front of the congregation. "If you did name one, I have forgot it."[105] Yet rather than being corrected, Abigail Williams would be allowed to speak, again and again, before another congregation of adults, who would imbue her words with deadly power. Faced with communal enemies invested in "stopping" children's mouths, children's speech in Salem became valued in remarkable ways.

Adult reactions to the children's words and, even more important, to the suffering those words described, were closely monitored. The violence of Indian warfare — and the way that warfare became formulated in print accounts — created an emotionally volatile environment in which the torture of a child became a matter that required constant revisiting, and with that revisiting, a repeated allocation of blame. In the Salem transcripts, as in captivity narratives, sympathy toward suffering children became a marker between good and evil. Rebecca Nurse, early in the crisis, echoed the com-

munity's sympathy for the afflicted. In a conversation before she was formerly accused of witchcraft, Nurse said that she was "greved for" the afflicted persons. She "pittied them with all her harte: and went to god for them."[106] On the stand, however, Judge Hathorne took her to task for her lack of feeling. "How can you," he demanded, "stand with dry eyes" while witnessing the suffering of the two girls Ann Putnam Jr. and Abigail Williams, among others? John Proctor had cause to regret his expressed lack of belief in, or compassion for, the suffering children who had previously testified. In conversation with a neighbor, Proctor is reported to have said that "if they [the afflicted] were left alone . . . we should all be Devils & witches quickly."[107] He boasted that he had told his afflicted servant Mary Warren that he would "thresh the Devil out of her."[108] John Proctor was accused of witchcraft in April 1692 and hung for the crime in August of the same year.

The interpretive framework for understanding how and why children were suffering, and for processing the testimony of children — and the adult afflicted who supported them — provides a salient glimpse into how children functioned as powerful points of intersection between native and English culture. In particular, the Salem judges' decision to allow spectral testimony as the sole evidence necessary for conviction, and their decision to have the afflicted children confront the accused in front of audiences, are perplexing choices when considered in light of the precedents of English law and Puritan theology. We cannot understand how the trials functioned if we remain within the confines of English culture. Only by acknowledging the multiple ways in which Indian culture had permeated the life of white Salem residents can we begin to come to terms with why Salem unfolded in the way it did.

Crossing Cultural and Spiritual Borders: The Trials as Powwow

More precisely, once we remember the child's material and imaginative power as a cultural emissary, and acknowledge the shifting emotional valences of suffering colonial children, we are faced with a startling proposition: The Salem witch trials, in many ways, resembled an Indian powwow as much as they did a European witch trial. In their willingness to believe that children were able to traverse the spiritual world, and more important, to believe that their reports of that world were credible, judges Hathorne and Corwin operated under a concept of children's spiritual capabilities that in

many ways resembled northeastern Indian beliefs more closely than English Puritan theology. More precisely, Salem's courtroom dynamics — which involved witnessing young people's spectacularly painful forays into the spiritual realm, and meeting their accounts with complete credulity — reflect Indian beliefs as well as English ones.

Indians were much more comfortable with what Puritans would call "spectral evidence" — the reports given by travelers in the invisible world — than Puritans would ever be. As Nancy Ruttenberg has written, "the near exclusive reliance upon spectral evidence, to the degree that it figured prominently in every conviction, appears to be the distinguishing characteristic of the Salem trials as compared both with earlier colonial witchcraft trials and European ones."[109] Spectral testimony, or the ability to "see with spectral eyes," had long been looked on with suspicion in Puritan theology because that theology depended on strictly demarcating the line between the devil and the divine. For the Puritans, any foray into the spiritual realm was deeply suspect, and any reporting from the world beyond could well be promoting the devil's agenda. Precedents in both European and American witchcraft trials had argued that the devil was skilled at visual trickery. As Increase Mather would write in *Cases of Conscience*, the devil "had perfect skill in Opticks, and can therefore cause to be visible to one, which is not so to another, and things also to appear far other then they are."[110] In other words, just because young Ann Putnam saw Goodwife Corey "praying to the devil" or playing with a witch's "familiar" did not mean that she could tell any particular truth about Corey's spiritual status. On previous occasions, such uncorroborated testimony, particularly from such a young girl, likely would have been dismissed as imagination, or at best, the deceptions of the devil, who showed false things to a child in order to persecute innocent and godly women. Even if the child's words were believed, corroborating evidence would need to be gathered. In Bury St. Edmunds and in Hartford, Connecticut, for instance, authorities needed some other physical proof (the water test or the touch test) to corroborate the words of a child, or as was likely in previous cases, the words of a parent speaking on behalf of a child.

Critics of the trials who were shocked by Salem's reliance on spectral evidence turned to scripture to illustrate the danger of trying to decipher the workings of the invisible world. Robert Pike of Salisbury, who signed a letter to Judge Jonathan Corwin, points out that God had strictly forbid-

den his followers from inquiring "of the dead, or to be informed by them." Indeed, he asks, "[i]f the root of their knowledge be the Devil, what must their testimony be?"[111] One way to account for the striking way Salem magistrates diverged from tradition when they gave credibility to the words of children who spoke of the "invisible world" is that contact with Indian religion had provided another, highly convincing template through which to view the capabilities of children as spiritual emissaries. In many of the northeastern tribes, children, particularly children approaching adolescence, occupied a particularly powerful position between the worlds of the visible and invisible.

In this respect, Tituba's confession — which, as Elaine Breslaw has demonstrated, wove together Indian, African, and English traditions — built on an already-existent foundation of intercultural knowledge in which children occupied a particularly powerful position. Long before Betty Parris became ill, New Englanders were familiar with Indian traditions in which particularly gifted individuals, named "powwows" or *pnieses* (the English often conflated the two), were favored with entry into the spiritual world, and were capable of reliably reporting on that world's workings.[112] These traditions depended on a belief that young people were particularly well suited to traverse the chasm between spirit and flesh. Roger Williams, in *A Key into the Language of America*, takes note of one young man who had experienced a vision "many years earlier," presumably as a child or adolescent: "I was once with a *Native* dying of a wound, given him by some murtherous *English* who rob'd him and run him through with a Rapier. . . . [D]ying of his wound, they suffered death at new *Plymouth*, in *New-England*, this *Native* dying call'd much upon *Muckquachukquiand, which of other Natives I understood (as they believed)* had appeared to the dying young man, many yeares before, and bid him call whenever he was in distress call upon him."[113]

As Matthew Mayhew notes in his 1694 *A Brief Narrative*, adults carefully monitored children for signs of the ability to enter the spiritual realm: "[The Indians] greatly esteemed and reverenced their Priests Powaws or Wizards, who were esteemed as having immediate converse with the gods . . . insomuch that Parents often out of certain Zeal, dedicated their Children to the gods, and Educated them accordingly observing certain Diet, debarring sleep, &c, yet of the many designed thus few earned their due."[114] As Edward Winslow notes in his 1624 tract *Good Newes from New England*, childhood was a time when these traits could first be activated:

> They train up the most forward and likeliest boys from their childhood in great hardness, and make them abstain from dainty meat, observing divers orders prescribed, to the end that when they are of age the Devil may appear to them, causing them to drink the juice of Sentry and other bitter herbs till they cast, which they must disgorge onto the platter, and drink again, and again, till at length through extraordinary oppressing of nature it will seem to be all blood, and this the boys will do with eagerness at the first, and so continue til by reason of faintness they can scarce stand on their legs, and then must go forth into the cold: also they beat their shins with sticks, and cause them to run through bushes stumps and brambles to make them hardy and acceptable to the Devil, so that in time he may appear unto them.[115]

Winslow, in his unequivocal assertion that the Indians meet "the Devil" echoes the long-standing belief that any message from the supernatural realm was deeply suspect. Thus when Tituba baked the witch cake to find out what was afflicting Betty Parris, she was at fault for going to the devil against the devil. Under this rubric, nothing the girls found out during their meetings with the devil, or his witches, should be trusted, at least not without corroboration from other sources.

Even as they sought to denigrate and dismiss native religion, English observers found themselves citing evidence for its power. Thomas Morton, in his 1632 *New English Canaan*, dismisses the "Powahs" as at best "weak witches" who perform little better than "jugling tricks," but he nonetheless describes an instance of a Powah's efficacy.[116] In this instance, he describes an English man who had a "swelling of his hand." An Indian takes the Englishman "into the woods aside from the company and with the helpe of the devil (as may be conjectured) quickly recovered that swelling, and sent him about his work againe."[117] Matthew Mayhew, for his part, plainly insists that Indian forays into the invisible world provide quite reliable evidence of what goes on in the visible realm: "Supposing that where the Practice of *Witchcraft* has been highly esteemed, there may be given the plainest demonstration, of Mortals having familiarity with *Infernal Spirits*, I am willing to let my reader know that not many years since, dyed here one of the *Powaw's* who never pretended to Astrological knowledge, yet could precisely inform such who desire his Assistance from whence Goods Stolen from them were taken, and whither carried; with many things of the like nature."[118] As Winslow's account of adolescents enduring the "oppressing of

nature" describes, these moments of entry to the spiritual realm came at a cost. Only by enduring physical suffering could the initiate enter a realm beyond the body. And it is precisely this process that was performed in front of a wonderstruck audience in Salem in trial after trial, as the girls enacted physical agony. Then, from their position of great pain, they reported on the invisible perpetrator. The tortures the young girls endured, while activating the mix of sympathy, helplessness, and fear so often elicited by children in captivity narratives, also traveled the native path to spiritual power in times of trial, and particularly during times of war.

Mary Rowlandson's account of a powwow describes a communal performance in which audience members' reactions pushed the spiritual traveler further than he might otherwise go. Her account tells us that "[b]efore they went to fight," the Wampanoags "got a company together to *Powaw*." In the scene she describes, the powwow "kneeled upon a Deerskin" and moved in and out of an enchanted ring in response to the reactions of "the company round him." According to Rowlandson, the vision of the powwow was sharpened and guided by the people who watched and called out to him: "And so he on the Deerskin began again; and at the end of every sentence in his speaking, they all assented, humming or muttering with their mouths, and striking upon the ground with their hands. Then they bade him with the two Guns go out of the ring which he did, a little way. Then they called him in again."[119] The powwow seems to resist this request and "stood reeling and wavering as if he knew not whither he should stand or fall, or which way to go." It took, it seems, the enthusiasm of the onlookers to move the process forward. "Then they called him with exceeding great vehemency," Rowlandson writes, "one and another: after a little while he turned in staggering as he went, with his Arms stretched out."[120]

Edward Ward, in his late seventeenth-century *A Trip to New England*, echoes Rowlandson as he describes a ritual of divination in which witnessing the "Agony" of the spiritual traveler is a vital part of the ritual to determine the secrets of the invisible world:

> Upon the breaking out of a War, or such extraordinary Occasions, as the old Romans consulted their *Oracles*, so do the *Indians* their *Pawaws*, which are a kind of *Wizards*: And at a General *Pawawing*, the Country a Hundred Miles round assemble themselves in a Body; and when they are thus met, they kindle a large Fire, round which the *Pawaw* walks, and beats himself upon his

> Breast, muttering out a strange sort of intricate Jargon, until he has Elivated himself into so great an Agony, that he falls down by the Fire in a Trance; during which time, the *Sagamores* ask him what they have a mind to know: After which, he is convey'd thro' the Fire, in the same posture that he lies, by a Power invisible, in the sight of the Spectators; then awakes, and Answers the several Questions ask'd by their *Kings* or *Sachems*.[121]

Keeping these accounts of a spiritual call-and-response in mind, let us return to Rebecca Nurse's trial — in which the afflicted girls, or as Hathorne calls them, "Ann Putnam the child & Abigail Williams," begin the complaints. Ann Putnam creates the bridge between the physical and spiritual world by falling into "a grievous fit" and then "cryed out that she [Rebecca Nurse] hurt her." Once the children initiate the process, adults, like the onlookers in Rowlandson's description, support and accentuate the visions of the initial traveler into the invisible realm.[122] Amid the fit of their daughter, the parents of Ann Putnam cry out against the accused, and then Mary Walcott and Elizabeth Hubbard (referred to by Hathorne as "two grown persons") join in.[123] Indeed the crowd's enthusiastic elaboration on the children's foray into the invisible world prompts the note taker to apologize for his inability to fully capture all that went on that day: "This a true account of the sume of her examination," the court document reads, "but by reason of geat noyses by the afflicted & many speakers, many things are pretermitted."[124]

This sort of communal back-and-forth was not to be easily found in contemporary English witch trials. In Bury St. Edmunds, parents related coherent and uninterrupted stories about children who were, for the most part, absent from the proceedings. One 1682 London account of the "Tryal, condemnation and executions of three witches" focuses almost entirely on the voice of the head witch — the account largely transcribes her seemingly prideful confessions.[125] In one case in the west of England in 1689, there was indeed a great crowd of people involved in determining a witch's guilt. Over one hundred people gathered to bring an afflicted young woman named Mary (she was about eighteen years old) and the "Old Witch" into proximity. Sure enough, the afflicted Mary fell into fits before the crowd. Yet, this act of afflicted performance was not enough to convict the witch. A "jury of women" was appointed to find marks of the devil on the accused. The account states that marks were found. After gathering that evidence, the witch was submitted to the water test three different times, during each of

which the old woman, according to various witnesses including "Persons of Quality," did "swim like a piece of cork."[126] Salem was remarkable for its ongoing courtroom performances featuring the words and acts of children. Even more remarkable was the magistrates' decision to take those words and performances *alone* as sufficient evidence to convict a large number of townspeople.

Once we take a closer look at native approaches to the invisible world — approaches witnessed and written about in several forums by the English settlers — the two most perplexing elements of the Salem trials become more comprehensible. The unprecedented decision to accept spectral testimony to such a large extent and the choice to allow the afflicted to meet their accusers in front of a large assembly — both acts that have long stymied historians — make more sense when considered in the context of native practices. In many ways, the emotional and cultural volatility the child possessed in colonial New England facilitated a precipitous slip into the territory the Puritans most dreaded.

The Puritans' great fear about the children's power as emissaries (and the child's concomitant vulnerability to Indian ways) became fact in Salem because of how adults were willing to interpret the core group of children. To be sure, it was the corroboration of the adult afflicted and the adult judges and onlookers that allowed the children to effectively lead the Salem community on a nine-month-long powwow. But the shifts in what children meant, and what a child's suffering demanded from adults — shifts that occurred alongside uneasy contact with native people — allowed the events to unfold in the way they did.

Once they let themselves be led by their children through a communal spiritual trial that veered dangerously close to the work of an Indian powwow, the adults of Salem, and the Anglo-American communities who discussed these accounts with avidity, would find it difficult to return to the seemingly certain binaries that had guided their world before. The numerous clashes between settler and native had created an emotional and cognitive matrix in which children emerged as emotionally transparent, culturally malleable, and, perhaps most important, elaborately suffering figures who should "move a heart of stone." These adult beliefs about children made it possible for those children to lead the town on a culture-crossing trial that ultimately complicated the idea of a readable transparent self. After covenanted church members were condemned of witchcraft because

of invisible evidence, one's actions could no longer be a reliable indicator of one's true intentions. As Ruttenberg has argued, those who committed to the children's spectral testimony "found themselves committed to a view of human personality as diabolically multifaceted." As a result of the trials, "hundreds were now perceived as endowed with a revolutionary power of dissemblance drawn from their ability to maintain a vital — and, in terms of character, a contradictory — presence in the visible and invisible domains simultaneously."[127] The blurring of boundaries extended to both the spiritual and the cultural worlds. The children's communal forays into the invisible world revealed that Indianness — which the Puritans wanted to cast as an alien presence as far removed from their own piety as Satan himself would be — was inextricably intertwined in the very personality of the village.

The events at Salem are a particularly dramatic example of how the child in early America functions as a conduit through which emotional responses to colonial violence would be processed. Acknowledging the powerful mix of feelings early Americans had for suffering children allows us to find connections between genres and between cultures that have been heretofore obscured. As I will discuss in the chapter that follows, the child victim of the captivity narrative in the later eighteenth century becomes an ever-more extravagant figure — one that would mediate emotional exchanges between whites and Indians in texts as widely divergent as Supreme Court decisions and Indian autobiography.

CHAPTER TWO

This Infant State

The Child Nation and Infanticide in the Early Republic

THE VIOLENCE DEPICTED in Maria Kittle's 1780 Indian captivity narrative clarifies the stakes in a conflict that had been muddied by unreliable promises. The Kittle household had received multiple assurances from their supposedly honorable Indian neighbors that they would not be harmed. Not long into the narrative, those assurances are proven murderously false. "Hideously painted" Indian villains burst into the home and kill Maria's brother-in-law. Next, the ringleader turns to Comelia, the dead man's wife. Apparently merely killing the woman with a blow to the head does not satisfy the "sanguinary soul" of the invader. After the dead woman collapses in front of him "he deformed her lovely body with deep gashes; and tearing her unborn babe away, dashed it to pieces against the stone wall."[1]

As the eighteenth-century Indian captivity narrative worked through the violent clashes along the frontier, the genre sought, like the villain in Maria Kittle's tale, to gain knowledge about — and thereby control of — the true inner state of adults by exposing a stylized child to scenes of horrific violence. In doing so, the narrative reflected the era's increased attention to the child, an attention at least partly driven by a desire to render the human interior legible. In the scene from the Kittle narrative, tearing the "unborn babe" from the womb functions as an extreme version of an increasingly prevalent metaphor.[2] Here, as in so many of the captivity narratives of both the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries, the threatened child figure unlocks meaning through scenes of violence wrought on vulnerability. In my previous chapter, I traced how the child victim emerged as a vital point

of colonial encounter between settlers terrified about losing hold on their Englishness and the Indians whose attitudes toward children threatened the Puritan sense of order. In this chapter, I examine the literary and legal legacies of the captivity narrative's stylized child victim as it grew in cultural force throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Traditionally, eighteenth-century narratives, rife with purple prose, have received less critical attention than the eschatological works collected by Cotton Mather, or the laconically moving narrative of Mary Rowlandson. By the end of the eighteenth century, the scenes of infanticidal violence in the genre had become so prevalent and so exaggerated that they could be easily dismissed as formulaic plot devices rather than anything resembling historical accounts. Depicting an enemy as a baby killer, after all, is hardly a tactic invented by American writers. "Can there be greater barbarity," Adam Smith asked in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, "than to hurt an infant?"[3] Infanticide, as many postcolonial scholars have pointed out, circulates as a near-universal trope for barbarity in contact zones throughout the globe, and has been deployed as such since biblical times. Violence against children, and in particular, against infants, has emerged across broad swaths of chronology and geography when one needs to depict the savagery of an enemy. Because of its long history, scholars have often read scenes of cross-cultural infanticide solely as the authors intended — as sensationalized shorthand that defines and demonizes the attacker, rendering the victim a cipher of briefly experienced pain that succumbs to its own fatal vulnerability.

However, reading infanticide solely as a trope obscures insight that a literary fascination with infanticide often derives from a historical reality in which spectacular violence is unfolding. As historian John Demos and others point out, infanticide was not merely a fictional construction of ethnocentric colonists but a real byproduct of the type of warfare that took place between the Indians and the English.[4] Colonization is bloody work, and inevitably much of the blood spilled in conflict will be the blood of the most vulnerable members of the community. Precisely because an act of violence against a child was so firmly entrenched in long-standing definitions of savagery, it provided a powerful emotional foundation on which eighteenth-century American writers and readers could forge new conceptual bridges to help them engage evolving colonial conflicts. Through its repetition, the act of infanticide serves as a representational touchstone on which

authors and readers map new definitions of both barbarity and the proper response to it.

More precisely, when considered within the very specific pressures of the eighteenth-century American frontier, the trope of infanticide worked to build the affective foundation for the decimation and dispossession of the native population. The horrors of the Kittle scene are part of a particularly dense symbolic system through which readers can face the terror of colonial violence by projecting it on Indian aggressors, while simultaneously creating emotional and cognitive templates that justify the necessity of such scenes. In the cited scene from the Kittle narrative, the spectacularly suffering (unborn) infant provides a colonial response to a central debate of the late eighteenth century: whether the "natural state" of humanity is one of dependence and weakness (what could be more dependent than a fetus in the womb?) or whether humans have fallen away from a radical stoicism (represented by the Indian who is wholly unmoved by the shrieks of his victims).

The figure of the victimized and vulnerable child in narratives of Indian-English engagement provides an important entry point into how the encounter between natives and whites was conceptualized in emotional, political, and legal terms. To begin with, the figure of the victimized child operated as a site of physical encounter — a focus on vulnerable children in the captivity narrative was a particularly effective way of processing the violence that was so often present on the frontier. The figure of the child also articulated both epistemological and emotional encounters, as native childrearing continued to pressure Western narratives about human origins. The pain of children — both native and white — proved important test cases for conceptualizing human nature itself. As I shall discuss, both captivity narratives that featured suffering children and childrearing advice that featured the disciplinary pain children *should* endure worked to clarify how emotional and mental states could be cultivated and divided across ethnic lines. Last, the figure of the suffering child provides a means of understanding how the encounter between natives and whites became articulated in legal and political terms as the figure of the dependent child was incorporated into government law and policy as the *only* subject position Indians could occupy in the new nation. The second half of this chapter draws on the construction of suffering childhood in captivity narratives and

in childrearing material to offer a new perspective on one of the first literary works by a Native American, William Apess's 1829 *Son of the Forest*. When read against the multiple valences attached to childhood pain in the early nineteenth century, Apess's careful attention to his own painfully vulnerable childhood emerges as a critique of the political and emotional theses that made the dependence of childhood a deadly space to occupy.

A close examination of the infanticidal violence portrayed in these popular texts disrupts the more familiar American narrative in which adulthood's independence emerges as a positive good. Instead, these narratives reveal an alternate rendering of both adulthood and childhood. If, as I have argued, Puritan narrators implicitly aligned Indian captors with punitive patriarchs, eighteenth-century narratives explicitly aligned the Indian captors with an idealized stoic — a widely acknowledged figure of radical independence and liberty, and the very antithesis of childhood dependence. For Indians in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, this stylized adulthood was a deadly role to occupy, because it prevented them from inclusion as colonial dependents in neopaternalistic U.S. rhetoric. It is precisely the figure of the infanticidal Indian stoic that William Apess will seek to undo in his 1829 autobiography — written at a historical moment when the Supreme Court suggested (in language resonant with the captivity narrative's imagery) that the "supreme independence" of the Indian justified his removal from the sphere of a government that could only accommodate colonized subjects who would occupy the role of a grateful ward.

Natural Man, the Indian, and the Child

Even as white writers increasingly demonized Indian villains, their rhetorical assumptions reveal the complex interdependence among Enlightenment thought, the politics of sentiment, and Native American culture — as that culture was both witnessed and imagined by white settlers in the United States, and by the European "authorities" from whom those white settlers took their cues. The child, like the Indian, was a vitally important subject of study for seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scientists, philosophers, and political theorists concerned with the origins of human nature. The fascination with both the child and the Indian was heightened by the lack of thorough knowledge about either subject. In 1780, Etienne Bonnot de

Condillac wrote that in order to understand the natural acquisition of knowledge, philosophers would need to "observe, in children, the first developments of our faculties, or to remember what happened to us in childhood."[5] However, the child's very lack of knowledge and communication renders wholly accurate observation of "first developments" impossible. The child may hold the secret of human origins, but our very distance from those origins made childhood a tantalizing, but ultimately mysterious, fount of knowledge.

Indians, or at least Western perceptions of them, were also part of an ongoing inquiry into human origins. The seventeenth-century philosopher Hugo Grotius, a pioneer in natural law and a major influence on Locke, was one of the first to equate natural man and the American Indian. In his 1625 *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis* Grotius writes, "The primitive state . . . exemplified in the community of property of extreme simplicity, may be seen among certain tribes in America which have lived for many generations in such a condition."[6] For Barbara Arneil, through Grotius's analogy, "[t]he state of nature has suddenly been profoundly transformed." Arneil argues that in Grotius's writing, and later in Locke's, the "state of nature as it has developed in political and Christian thought from Cicero to Aquinas is . . . wholly grafted, without consideration for the implications, on to the European notion of America and its natives."[7] Theorists have suggested that philosophers were, in fact, acutely aware of the implications that Grotius's rhetorical move would have for the future of the colonial enterprise. For example, the conception of private property later articulated by Locke was keenly adaptable to the needs of English settlers who wanted to lay claim to what would come to be considered "unenclosed lands."[8]

Hard Children and Noble Savages

Enlightenment pedagogues Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke are generally considered the antitheses of dour Calvinist ideas about childhood, yet both men are as deeply concerned with the role of pain in childrearing as their more dogmatic counterparts. Moreover, both men's ideas about pain were deeply intertwined with a concept of natural man that evoked the Indians of North America. Hugo Grotius may have begun the tradition of drawing on Native Americans as a model for natural man, but it was a tradition that both Locke and Rousseau were very willing to continue.

Locke, an avid reader of colonial travel literature, turned to the new world as a model of political and social origins. "In the beginning," he wrote in *The Second Treatise of Government*, "all the world was America."[9] For Locke, as for Rousseau and other eighteenth-century thinkers, the desire to imaginatively construct a point of origin that could supply a "natural man" led to a conflation of the Indian and the child. For Locke, both the child and the Indian share the simple object relations of the uneducated and uncivilized: "Amongst *children*, *idiots*, *savages* and the grossly illiterate, what general maxims are to be found? What universal principles of knowledge? . . . A child knows his nurse, and his cradle, and by degree the playthings of little more advanced age. And a young savage has, perhaps, his head filled with love and hunting, according to the fashion of his tribe."[10] Throughout his 1754 *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, Rousseau looks to the "savages of America" to illustrate the state of nature. So if both Indians and children provide a glimpse into long-lost "natural man," perhaps it is not surprising that both Locke and Rousseau draw from colonial visions of hearty Native Americans — among other colonized people — in their childrearing advice. Critics have long agreed that both these European men had a wide influence on North American conceptions of both the material and political child by the eighteenth century. Yet few have noted that Locke's and Rousseau's childrearing advice — and in particular their endorsement of physical hardening — was at least partially the product of the writers' admiration for what they had heard of Native American childrearing practices in earlier colonial literature. These travel narratives describing Indian life, in turn, were filtered through colonists' own beliefs and experiences.

Although Locke and Rousseau are often noted for their emphasis on sensation in creating human knowledge, for them the body's receptivity rendered it susceptible to unwanted influences as well as wholesome ones. They are both concerned with the allegedly debilitating effects of social comfort. Hence, Rousseau suggests in *Émile* that the only book his young charge should read is that paean to isolation — Daniel Defoe's 1719 *Robinson Crusoe:*

> Robinson Crusoe on his island, alone, deprived of the help of his fellow men and of the tools of every art, yet providing for his own subsistence, his own preservation, and even procuring for himself a kind of well-being — here is an object interesting for every age and that one can find a thousand ways to

> make pleasing to children. Here is how we can make a reality of that desert island which formerly served as an illustration. This state, I admit, is not that of social man; probably it is not that of Emile; but it is on the basis of this same state that he should judge all the others. The surest way to raise oneself above prejudice and to base his judgments on the true relations of things is to put oneself in the place of a solitary man and to judge all things as they would be judged by such a man in relation to their own utility.[11]

Rather than celebrating the body's role as the profoundly porous site that many Christian traditions saw as a means for accessing the divine, Rousseau insists the proper physical state is one of complete autonomy — unimpeded by the weaknesses of "social man." Self-sufficiency, both emotional and physical, is the ideal state of a child who will grow up to be a truly independent citizen. Both Locke and Rousseau argue against beating children because corporal punishment gives pain too much power over a child who needs to attain detachment from outside influence. For Locke the "lazy and short way" of disciplining children by beating them worked against a parent's ultimate aim — a child well schooled in self-control and self-denial.[12] "This kind of punishment," Locke insists, "contributes not at all to the mastery of our natural propensity to indulge corporal and present pleasure and avoid pain at any rate: but rather encourages it and thereby strengthens that in us which is the root from whence spring all vicious actions and the irregularities of life."[13] A stoic detachment from the importunities of painful emotional and physical stimuli represents one of the key criteria marking the entry to Enlightenment adulthood. This model of absolute autonomy — of an individual independent of the base desire to pursue pleasure and avoid pain — would arguably produce citizens who would be able to use reason to make choices for their own long-term good, and for the good of the state at large.

While it is tempting, perhaps, to view Locke's and Rousseau's view of the American Indians as solely the product of their own rhetorical and political inclinations, doing so obscures the considerable influence Indian culture had on European ideas about human origins. The early reports of robust Indian children that began to make their way east in the early seventeenth century grew in popularity in the eighteenth, fostering an admiration for the stoicism the Indians seemed to display. As early as 1535, Captain Jacques Cartier reports that among Native Canadians, "the men" as well as "women

and children are much more able to resist cold than savage beasts."[14] Later accounts of Indian life, in turn, serve to reinforce many of the aspects philosophers had found most intriguing. Benjamin Rush, in 1774, reiterates an aspect of Indian childrearing that was emblematic of Rousseau's childrearing philosophy. In an address to the American Philosophical Society he reports favorably on the Indian technique of hardening children by their being "plunged every day in cold water."[15]

In turn, the framework of republican stoicism that became so popular throughout England and the colonies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries influenced the ways in which Europeans viewed Indian childrearing, often explicitly framing their observations of native life in classical republican terms. As Andrew Fitzmaurice, building on the work of Karen Ordhal Kupperman, has noted, representations of the New World often drew on familiar visions of the old.[16] Because so much of early colonial literature was written in an explicitly persuasive manner, Fitzmaurice suggests, writers drew on the rules of classical rhetoric, which suggest that, in order to stretch a listener's mind to embrace what might be alien, rhetoricians must make comparisons to what is familiar and beloved. The rules of classical rhetoric share much with the findings of cognitive theorists on the workings of metaphor — a known quantity allows for the incorporation of the novel, ultimately reshaping both the familiar and the strange in relation to one another. To change readers from a state of fear, distrust, or simple disinterest in the New World to a state that would embrace large investments in such enterprises, Fitzmaurice writes, it is necessary to "bring them [the readers] to the belief that the New World embraces the qualities which they most value in the Old."[17]

For many writers, Indians' radically different ways of interacting with the natural environment evoked the storied physical hardiness of classical stoics. Emergent European visions of how to raise a child in alignment with nature's dictates were deeply enmeshed with representations, and appropriations, of Indian hardiness. In a passage praising Spartan stoicism, Rousseau creates what Ann Laura Stoler has called a "circuit of knowledge" that connects European, Anglo-American and Indian practices. In the *Discourse*, Rousseau describes a vision of "natural" self-sufficiency that reveals an extended conceptual interdependence between the white European child (a model for at least some Anglo-American parents), the "natural man" often equated with American Indians, and a nostalgic vision of classical stoicism:[18]

> Accustomed from their infancy to the inclemencies of the weather and the rigour of the seasons, inured to fatigue, and forced, naked and unarmed, to defend themselves and their prey from other ferocious animals, or to escape them by flight, men would acquire a robust and almost unalterable constitution. The children, bringing with them into the world the excellent constitution of their parents, and fortifying it by the very exercises which first produced it, would thus acquire all the vigour of which the human frame is capable. Nature in this case treats them exactly as Sparta treated the children of her citizens: those who come well formed into the world she renders strong and robust, and all the rest she destroys; differing in this respect from our modern communities, in which the State, by making children a burden to their parents, kills them indiscriminately before they are born.[19]

In this vision, disability and dependence are sins against the natural order punishable by death. In order to reclaim this mythical independence, Rousseau advises parents to embrace the painful importunities of nature. In *Émile*, Rousseau tells us that "[m]an is born to suffer" and that "pain is the means of his preservation."[20] By exposing the child to pain in a proper fashion, white parents could metaphorically dip their children's mental capacities "in the waters of Styx."[21] On repeated exposure to discomfort, it is suggested, the child will be able to cultivate a stoic detachment from that discomfort, and develop the ability to take action based solely on reason rather than on a fear of pain or an appetite for pleasure. "Accustom them therefore to hardships they will have to face," Rousseau tells parents. "[T]rain them to endure extremes of temperature, climate, and condition, hunger thirst and weariness," and children will evolve into subjects who will be unmoved by bodily afflictions.[22]

Both English and French settlers found the classical vision of stoicism a useful framework to represent native lifeways. In 1724, for instance, Joseph Francis Lafitau writes that although Indians do not have the sort of regulations the ancient Greeks enjoyed, they share "the same spirit of austerity."[23] "Since their life in itself is hard," Lafitau explains, "and lacks many things necessary for nourishment, clothing and other things, it contributes no little to hardening them, making them capable of enduring hunger, thirst, the rigours of the seasons and other hardships which we [the French] are seen to succumb because we have had too weak and too sensual an education."[24] In his 1754 work *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, Rousseau lauds the

faculties of the Indians, declaring that the "savages of America . . . support nakedness without pain" — a state not far from Achilles after his dip in the River Styx, and if one follows Rousseau's advice, the proper state of the child-citizen-to-be.[25] Thus influential European instruction on how to raise a good citizen takes many of its cues from the American Indian, who is often viewed through the prism of neoclassical thought. In a colonizing circuit of knowledge the novel childrearing strategies of Native Americans invoke in Europeans a nostalgic yearning for classical stoicism as a mode of personal deportment, as potential emblem for proper government, and as strategy for raising republican children.

In his 1800 *History of America*, historian William Robertson works well within Rousseau's template, directly relating the "savage" upbringing of the Indians to their natural love of independence:

> But if there be defects or vices peculiar to the savage state, there are likewise virtues which it inspires, and good qualities, to the exercise of which it is friendly. The bonds of society sit so loose upon the members of the more rude American tribes, that they hardly feel any restraint. Hence the spirit of independence, which is the pride of the savage, and which he considers the unalienable prerogative of man. Incapable of controul [sic], and disdaining to acknowledge any superior, his mind, though limited in its powers, and erring in many of its pursuits acquires such elevation by the consciousness of its own freedom.[26]

Robertson here adheres to a formulation that will be paralleled in legal decisions a generation later. According to Euro-American accounts, the neostoic upbringing of Indians leads inevitably to a great love of liberty, or "spirit of independence." While such a spirit is essential for white children who must live up to their nation's founding love of independence, it will be considered untenable for a people over whom the United States wants to rule.

When they compared natives — implicitly or explicitly — to Stoics, writers were intervening in another set of comparisons, in which stoicism was being deployed to articulate the emotional and ethical dilemmas of colonialism. In her study of the popular seventeenth- and eighteenth-century genre the "Roman play," Julie Ellison discusses the existence of a "Cato discourse."[27] In this discourse, the masculine relationships portrayed in Whig literature glorify stoic Cato, a man who would come to represent "individual liberty beholden to no one."[28] Tellingly, in Addison's *Cato*, the self-sacrificial son is

actually an African colonial subject who wishes to emulate his conquering "father." Ellison reads plays like Addison's *Cato* and *Lucius Junus Brutus* as templates for a republican model that played out in a dynamic relationship between men wherein a son suffers transparently and extravagantly. The son's pain then invokes in his father a deep pain, which the father must nonetheless suppress in order to enact a just, dispassionate, and rational dispensation of law. "Insofar as the son consents to suffer," she contends, "the language of sensibility justifies rigor in the name of law."[29] More important, Addison's *Cato* revealed the reciprocity between stoicism and sensibility in republican discourse. As Ellison points out, no less than Adam Smith takes pains to recuperate manly tears like Cato's within a framework of stoic reserve: "[W]e reverence that reserved, that silent and majestic sorrow, which discovers itself only in the welling of the eyes, in the quivering of the lips and cheeks, and in the distant, but affecting, coldness of the whole behavior."[30] Cato, who commits suicide — the ultimate act of self-denial — in service of the larger cause, was a popular figure in the colonies. He emerged as an iconic resister to all forms of tyranny, and figured prominently in the writings of Benjamin Franklin and other founding fathers. Indeed, George Washington had the play performed at Valley Forge, presumably thinking it an inspiring story for men who seemed quite likely to become, like Cato, a martyr for liberty. The careful attention to the thoroughly understated emotion of the stoic sets a standard for a republican masculinity — a subject who feels deeply but betrays little of that feeling.

The captivity narrative shares the Whig play's fascination with the moment of sacrifice but dispels any illusion of voluntarism. The hero who willingly sacrifices himself for empire while choking back manly tears is replaced by an infant who screams and cries in helpless terror. This focus on the suffering child allows the Indian captivity narrative to create clear lines of division between stoic reserve and sentimental anguish. Rather than the stoic father and weeping son who were so important in *Cato* and other Whig plays, the captivity narrative changes the scene of colonial sacrifice to parse strong feelings along three racially constructed subject positions.[31] In the captivity narrative's formulation, the child feels everything and suffers extravagantly (and fatally). The Indian adult feels nothing and acts with brutal clarity. The white colonial subject must somehow align himself or herself between the two.

Stoic Indians, Vulnerable Children

The central scene of Indian violence wrought on vulnerable white children puts the morality of stoic detachment to the test. The victimized white child acts as a pivot point between the two contending emotional states of repulsion and desire for the Indian. These scenes of suffering childhood catalyze the affect of white adult witnesses, who must array their emotional responses between a radical stoicism and a debilitating sensibility — choices the narrative will inevitably critique as more or less useful within the frontier environment. More precisely, the adult reactions to child victims articulate the stakes of adopting a particular emotional response. Those stakes reveal the anxieties about both the radical liberty associated with stoicism and the vulnerability associated with uncontrollable emotion.

The late eighteenth-century captivity narrative emerged amid the revolutionary era's fascination with fostering stoic reserve in children to make them proper citizens. Yet the captivity narrative's roots in a Puritan tradition that saw painful experience as evidence of God's corrective hand set the stage for a clash between hard-hearted stoicism and all-consuming sensibility. As I discussed in chapter 1, in Christian theology, and certainly in Puritan writing, the body figures as a permeable entity, capable of transmitting painful messages inflicted from without as well as reflecting the workings of grace (or sin) within. Although, or perhaps because, the doctrine of predetermination had long denied reliable exterior signs of the soul's true state, Calvinist rhetoric in the colonies had consistently fixated on physical signifiers of the invisible workings of the divine.[32] Often, those workings involved the pain of a believer. Affliction — God's mortifying the body to awaken the soul — was a process by which pain could bridge the gap between the visible and invisible worlds. In other words, the wounds of the afflicted functioned as the fingerprints of God. As Elaine Scarry suggests in her analysis of Old Testament models of suffering, "the invisible (and hence periodically disbelieved-in) divine power has a visible substantiation in the alterations in body tissue it is able to bring about."[33] In Calvinist thought, pain often acts as an individual divining rod that verifies a relationship to God. Elaine Forman Crane has argued that ministers were divided about whether pain functioned solely as a punishment for sin, or a means of redemption from it.[34] But either way, pain meant God was involved. Mary

Rowlandson's seventeenth-century narrative cites a passage from scripture to explain her relationship to suffering: "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every Son whom he receiveth."[35] Only by allowing affliction to permeate one's inner state — only by *feeling* the chastening and scourging hand of God — could a subject achieve the intensely personal relationship with God that held the promise of salvation. Yet to suffer was not enough. The largely interior experience of physical pain must be made meaningful through a public demonstration of the effects such pain has wrought.

The child, whose innate depravity necessitated particular attention in Puritan thought, was an important test case for how physical affliction might reclaim a recalcitrant soul. Beginning with the earliest settlers, and persisting well into the eighteenth century, scores of sermons warned parents that if they spared their child the physical punishment they needed, they were endangering them with everlasting perdition. James Janeway's 1675 *Token for Children*, one of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' most popular works of juvenile literature, takes this equation one step further, reading the signs of sickness and suffering written on the child's body as direct confirmation that God's grace had taken root within.[36] The text, the most widely read book in English nurseries next to *Pilgrim's Progress* and the Bible, offers a model for cultivating child virtue that diverged starkly from the hardening strategy that would later be espoused by Locke, Rousseau, and other Enlightenment pedagogues. Cotton Mather was so struck by Janeway's text that he reprinted it for American audiences in 1675, appending his own tales of pious children, called *A Token for the Children of New England*. The paradigm Janeway sets up is revisited throughout the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth. In Janeway's model, the bodies of exemplary children render suffering and godliness inextricable — Janeway's tales describe scenarios where physical sickness and suffering actually validate the child's interior state. One typical vignette features a sequential description of one young girl's movement from piety to pain:

9. She abhorred lying, and allowed herself in no known sin.
10. She was very Conscientious in spending of time, and hated idleness, and spent her whole time either in praying, reading, instructing at her Needle, at which she was very ingenious.

11. When she was at school, she was eminent for her diligence, meekness and modesty, speaking little; but when she did speak it was usually spiritual.
12. She continued in this course of Religious duties for some years together.
13. When she was about fourteen years old, she brake a Vein in her lungs (as is supposed) and oft did spit blood, yet did a little recover again, but had several dangerous relapses.[37]

The choice to tell the tale of the child's spiritual piety and physical degeneration as a sequence suggests a causal relationship where one attribute inevitably leads to another. Number twelve — her pious religious duties — leads seamlessly to the dangerous illness charted by number thirteen. Suffering here does not act as a cause, but as an effect, of a godly inner state.

The seismic shift in American Protestantism wrought by the Great Awakening further intensifies the relationship Janeway posits between physical suffering and individual religious enlightenment. As I discuss in greater detail in chapter 3, New Light Calvinists like George Whitefield expounded on the Puritan insistence that conversion experience was always marked by deep suffering, and they often rendered such suffering in explicitly corporal terms. The experience of deeply felt physical pain and revulsion was in itself an indication that a new spiritual birth was at hand. Whitefield famously and visibly suffered both before and during his spectacular sermons. Arguably, this metaphorical awareness of one's afflicted and pain-stricken body had already been rendered "in the flesh" of the children Janeway, Mather, and others had depicted. As missionary David Brainerd would testify in his journal, these depictions of suffering saints often wrought an indelible impression on young readers.[38]

As it charted the trials of the frontier, the later captivity narrative echoed Christianity's portrait of children as exquisitely permeable, transparent beings. Children in these stories are completely overwhelmed by painful violence, and, more important, they are completely unable to mask that pain. Inevitably, their transparency costs them their lives. In Elizabeth Hanson's narrative "God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty," published first in 1728 and again in 1760, a young child meets her end precisely because her youth prevents her from hiding her pain and anguish. In the first moments of attack, the narrator turns to Hanson's four-year-old, whose shrieks of terror continue in spite of the nurse's frantic urgings for quiet. The nursemaid is

handling a six-year-old as well, but tellingly, the younger child is unable to effectively mask her terror, while the older child is able to listen to reason and assume the façade of calm. The younger pays dearly for the inability to dissemble. Hanson relates how "the Indians, to ease themselves of the Noise, and to prevent the Danger of a Discovery that might arise from it, immediately before my Face knockt its Brains out."[39] The child loses its life precisely because its physical performance wholly represented the terror it felt. Hanson displays a canny understanding of the forces at work, and helps to preserve the six-year-old child by suppressing her own distress and presenting an exterior that does not provoke her attacker further. She tells us that "I bore this as well as I could, not daring to appear disturb'd, or shew much uneasiness, lest they should do the same to the other."[40] Hanson's concern would certainly be justified by the plots of dozens of other narratives, where the inability of infants and young children to mask their inner distress with a dispassionate exterior results in their deaths.

A narrative detailing the "sufferings of Massy Herberson and her family," who were taken captive in 1792, casts the Indians as active enemies of childhood's transparent emotion. According to this narrative, a five-year-old boy is allowed to live for some time after the initial captivity, but once he begins to "mourn for his brother" he is summarily dispatched.[41] Building on the trope of the Indian stoic, captors are considered intolerant of any pain whatsoever. In 1791, Jackson Johonnot catalogs a series of horrors that befell any who did not meet the ideal of calm fortitude. According to Johonnot, all who "fainted under their heavy trials were immediately scalped and tomahawked in our presence, and tortured to death with every affliction and misery that Indian ingenuity could invent."[42] Here, as in many like accounts, the historical reality of death inflicted on those who slowed the progress of the group becomes translated into a narrative where the weakness of children becomes fused with the virtuous suffering of Christian martyrs. In 1757, Peter Williamson takes explicit notice of the disjunction between the extravagant sufferings of the young captives and the impassive stance of their captors. He takes pains to note "the cries, the shrieks, and tears of a parcel of infants, had no effect on, or caused the least remorse in the breasts of these merciless wretches."[43]

On the frontier, one's capacity for stoicism translates into the difference between life and death. Within the polarizing framework of the captivity genre, the Indian emerges as incapable of being moved by suffering, while

the white child emerges as a cipher of deeply and visibly felt pain. In the conflicting pressures channeled through the politics of sensibility, the impetus to cast the Indians as inhuman clashes with the very ideals of self-denying stoicism that were being embraced on political and pedagogical grounds. Teresa Toulouse's rigorous definition of ambivalence is particularly useful in approaching how these later captivity narratives accommodate *both* the desire to demonize the Indians and the desire to emulate them. Toulouse, building on the work of J. Laplanche and J. B. Poltalis, suggests that an analytically useful concept of ambivalence should "not refer to conflicts in which one position necessarily undermines the other, but to an emotional attitude in which two positions exist simultaneously."[44] In the context of the captivity narrative, stoicism is both admirable and inhuman. In the captivity narrative, the Indian's dispassionate adherence to the good of the community at the expense of the individual (a crying child might draw unwanted attention, a physically weak child could endanger the progress of the rest of the tribe) is denied the moral value it accrues in the Anglophone Roman play, even as the Indian warrior enacts choices that Cato might well approve.

Cast in the middle of the opposing tension between the all-feeling child and the stony-hearted captor, the white adults in the captivity narrative must determine the extent to which their pain and grief should dictate their actions within the poles of unbridled liberty and abject slavery that many political theorists would come to see as the inevitable choices facing the newly democratic nation. This distribution of emotion plays out not only along ethnic lines, but also along gendered ones, although not in the ways one might expect. Maternal grief in these narratives allows women to occupy a position wielding unbridled rage and violence. Male captives, on the other hand, often highlight their own vulnerable sensibility in order to differentiate themselves from the Indians. Thus as white men and women poise themselves in the space between the emotionally transparent white infant and the supposedly stoic Indian, their responses to the pain they feel, and witness in others, often transgress the gendered roles prescribed in Anglophone culture. Teresa Toulouse has illustrated how powerfully the image of the passive female captive allowed seventeenth-century male elites to think through questions of masculine authority. I suggest that these later narratives' focus on extreme violence toward children allowed for the play of cross-gendered identification in ways that also invited blurring racial, ethnic, and religious lines.

Although the figure of the half-Indianized frontiersman would grow in popularity throughout the nineteenth century, the years framing the Revolution often featured the stories of male captives more invested in proving their moral sensitivity than their ability to equal the Indians' stoic strength. In 1757, Peter Williamson, who speaks with horror of his captors' supposed indifference to the pain of children, charts a particularly arduous exploration of the white male body's resistance to pain. His captors, "taking the burning coals and sticks, flaming with fire at the ends, holding them near my face, head, hands, and feet, with a deal of monstrous pleasure and satisfaction; and at the same time, [they were] threatening to burn me entirely if I cried out. Thus tortured as I was, almost to death, I suffered their brutal pleasure without being allowed to vent my inexpressible anguish."[45] At this juncture, the pain inflicted on Williamson's body acts as a crucible in which the white male citizen-subject could be formed. The stoic model in which Williamson would haughtily dismiss the worst efforts of his antagonists would, in this case, precisely mirror the proper act of a valiant Indian brave who was renowned for his resistance to the pain of torture. According to the captivity narrative's long history of aligning deeply felt suffering with moral value — exemplified by Williamson's extended attention to the "merciless" Indians who remain unaffected — Williamson should shed the tears which denote his ability to feel the afflictions visited on him. Yet, in this case, such sensitivity could likely prove deadly, as it did for the infants he described earlier in the same narrative.

The model of republican stoicism — buttressed on both sides of the Atlantic by European impressions of Indian childrearing as well as Indian responses to torture — would seem to be the only mode of surviving the harsh challenges of the American environment. However, in this scene, Williamson chooses to stress the suffering that marks his difference from the Indians rather than impress readers (or his Indian captives) with his detachment from physical importunities. His need to "vent his inexpressible anguish" manifests in "silent tears," tears his enemies deem evidence of failure and weakness. In a seeming parody of the sort of nurture one would extend toward a small child, "when these inhuman tormentors observed [Williamson's tears] with a shocking pleasure and alacrity, they would take fresh coals and apply near my eyes, telling me my face was wet, and that they would dry it for me, which indeed they cruelly did."[46] Williamson's inability to manage bodily performance here causes him more pain, but also

reinforces a sharp divide between his capacity for feeling and that of his torturers.[47]

Some of the most popular narratives of the later eighteenth century feature female protagonists who perform their pain by embodying the anarchic rage associated with the Indians themselves, rather than sorrow or passivity. The most famous of these stories, the narrative of Hannah Dustan's dramatic escape from captivity, dates from early in the eighteenth century, but repeated reprintings, as well as retellings by authors such as Hawthorne and Thoreau, testify to its popularity throughout the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth.[48] In his version of Dustan's narrative, Cotton Mather builds on the equation of a dead child with unassailable virtue to justify an otherwise shocking response to Indian abduction. As Mather tells us, the Indians take the Dustan party, but "e'er they had gone many Steps, they dash'd out the Brains of the *Infant* against of the Tree."[49] Here, as in Janeway's vignettes, Whitefield's sermons, and Williamson's tears, victimhood acts as an indicator of the inner goodness of the sufferer.

The death of the child in this case not only casts the Indians as villains, as one might expect, but also invests Dustan with unassailable moral authority. According to Mather, this act of infanticide renders Dustan's subsequent murder of all ten of her captors (including six children) not simply excusable but praiseworthy. She felt that "she was not forbidden by any *Law* to take away the *Life* of the *Murderers*," Mather writes, "by whom her Child had been Butchered."[50] The pain of personal loss nullifies the laws of both God and man, granting complete, unfettered liberty to the sufferer. Certainly, such a scene of powerful female aggression was not unproblematic — Toulouse's recent study deftly illustrates the difficulties that Dustan's actions, and the fame that attended them, caused for Mather. He drew from the narrative more than once, as he sought to use Dustan as an emblem of feminized humiliation and passivity.[51] His success, it must be said, was limited. After all, Dustan's actions cross theological, gendered, and ethnic lines in dramatic ways. Put simply, she acts like a mythologized Indian warrior, unfazed by the prospect of scalping six sleeping children to avenge the death of her own child.

Dustan's murderous revenge, and the glory it brought her, renders a subtext of the captivity genre shockingly explicit. If one wants to survive in the land of the Indians, one has to possess the Indian's stoic capacity to spill the blood of innocents. Colonization requires bloodshed, and if one is

squeamish about it, Dustan's tale suggests, the colony will simply not survive. Another popular story, which has come to be known as "The Panther Captivity," features a woman whose actions rival the alleged atrocities of the most hardened natives. Like Dustan's tale, the Panther Captivity was very popular — it was published more than twenty times in small pamphlets all over the northeast between 1787 and 1814, usually as some variation of the title "An Account of a Beautiful Young Lady."[52] In this tale, the heroine watches in horror as her captors "barbarously murdered [her] lover, cutting and mangling him in a most inhuman manner." She is then taken captive by another Indian, who desires her sexually. Unable to face the prospect of being an Indian consort (a position that would likely render her the mother of a mixed-race child) the besieged woman finds the "resolution" that allows her "with three blows [to] effectually put an end to [her tormentor's] existence."[53] After she has killed her would-be assailant, she mimics the "barbarous treatment" she witnessed the Indians perpetrate, cutting and mangling her victim. Indeed she goes several steps further, beheading and quartering the corpse to better hide it. Tellingly, after this act of barbarism, the lady seems well able to make herself at home in the wilderness. According to the narrator, they found the heroine living in a cave, where she had resided comfortably for the past nine years. For both Dustan and the "lady," the personal pain of affective bereavement (for one, the loss of a child, for the other, the loss of a future family with her lover) allows these women to transcend the public boundaries of female propriety, and indeed, the boundaries of any law at all.

A famous son of liberty, Thomas Paine, would likely agree with these women's logic, even as his rhetoric excludes women from participation in his vision of privately inspired public violence:

> Hath your property been destroyed before your face? Are your wife and children destitute of a bed to lie on, or bread to live on? Have you lost a parent or a child by their hands, and yourself the ruined and wretched survivor? If you have not, then you are not a judge of those who have. But if you have and can still shake hands with the murderers, then are you unworthy of the title of husband, father, friend or lover, and whatever may be your rank in life, you have the heart of a coward, and a spirit of a sycophant.[54]

The pain occasioned by grief here has the power to transform both public and private roles — if one does not capitalize on that power, one effectively

loses the right to both one's public rank and the private titles of "husband, father friend or lover." The murderous rage, encouraged by Paine, and embodied by these female captives, contrasts sharply with the passive pain and grief suffered by Peter Williamson, and the countless child-victims he resembles. These alternations between violent rage and tearful submission, I suggest, reflect the two extremes of excessive liberty and abject slavery often cited as two possible pitfalls for the infant nation.[55] Notably, both extremes are generated by the protagonist's unfailing sensibility. The ability to feel pain deeply, which emerges as an essential point of opposition to the Indians, nonetheless moves the sufferers to take action in the captivity narrative that would prove disastrous if adopted by the nation as a whole.

In between the anarchic rage of warrior women like Dustan and the passive tears of genteel men like Williamson, there exists another type of protagonist, a hybrid narrator who describes her tale in elaborately emotional language while acting in a way that ultimately privileges a stoic's suppression of her emotions. In Mary Kinnan's 1795 tale, as in so many others, the moral center of the conflict originates in the brutal murder of young children. At first, at the scene of her child "scalped and slaughtered," Mary Kinnan seems completely overwhelmed by her grief.[56] Displaying a completely transparent relationship between mind and body, Kinnan describes herself as the virtual embodiment of mourning, deprived of the ability to think rationally, her pain transporting her beyond the ken of language. Kinnan's wild grief, like Dustan's rage and Williamson's tears, represents a porous exchange between interior pain and exterior performance most fully exemplified by the child's transparent expression of its fears and desires. The bodily performance of these mothers acts as a metonymic elaboration of the child's own pain: the affliction of children creates and clarifies the visible sensibility of mourning mothers and the impermeability of stoic captors.

In Lockean terms, however, Kinnan's maternal grief renders her not an emblem of Christian virtue, but a subject in danger of becoming a slave. Tellingly, the mourning mother was, for Locke, the quintessential example of a mind in danger of losing its rational dominion. In his 1706 *Of the Conduct of the Understanding*, he writes that overwhelming notions of "love or anger, fear or grief" wield a form of "tyranny" on the "understanding."[57] And indeed, Kinnan seems utterly dominated by her emotions, having lost the ability to consent to a viable course of action, or even to deploy language to gain some perspective on her position. She asks the reader to "[s]pare

me the pain of describing my feelings at this scene, this mournful scene, which racked my agonizing heart and precipitated me to the verge of madness."[58] Within the cultural and philosophical entanglements undergirding the captivity narrative, Kinnan is doubly tyrannized — on one level by the demonized Indians who are cast as unnaturally detached from sympathy, and on another level by her own excessive feeling. Kinnan's maternal love here displaces the self-sovereignty so vital to the republican ethos, leaving her to the mercy of her foes.

But Kinnan, like Hanson, must deviate from the emotional transparency of the child she has lost if she wishes to avoid the same fate. Although couched in the language of sensibility, Kinnan's tale charts the ability of the protagonist to develop a stoic demeanor that had been overtly linked to the atrocities of the Indians. As her journey progresses, she manages to strike a balance between the keen experience of suffering that marks her moral standing and the reclaiming of self-government that will allow her to survive. Although she insists that she "became indifferent to [her own] existence," so indifferent that she was willing "to bid adieu to that world whence all the lovely relatives of life were borne before [her]," she finds herself nonetheless "restrained by the spirit of Christianity" and manages to produce the appearance of fortitude that allows her to survive among an enemy cast as intolerant of any weakness.[59]

While the sensationalized death of the infant promises to provide a moral taxonomy ordered by the capacity of adults to either share or inflict the child's pain, the captivity narrative allows no easy resolution. On a rhetorical level, its meticulous exploration of the topography of suffering critiques the celebration of disembodied stoic reason, privileging instead the deeply embodied exchange between emotional, spiritual, and physical experience espoused by New Light Calvinists and Common Sense philosophers alike. Of course, readers, through their vicarious identification with the pain of the story's martyrs, could assure themselves that their capacity to be "affected" confirmed their own finely calibrated sensibility. Such sensibility clarifies their difference from the tyrant/savage who was incapable of deeply feeling suffering. And in fact this is the reading offered by several critics who place the captivity narrative in the sentimental tradition that would flourish in the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries.[60]

On a structural level, however, the tale of captivity reveals that the very sensibility it wants to glorify represents a dangerous liability for those who

want to colonize the American environment. Amid the challenges of the wilderness, a body easily affected by exterior circumstances is a body that will simply not survive. Hannah Dustan's ability to "go native" and scalp her sleeping enemies results in fame and moderate fortune. Peter Williamson's finely tuned sensibility results in excruciating torture. And of course, the children who cannot control their feelings never stand a chance. The suffering of a child initiates a dynamic that allows authors to tentatively calibrate the emotional nuances of a prospective American subject. The increasing hostility of later captivity narratives toward Indians speaks of many things — the growing readiness to adapt a policy of Indian removal is perhaps the one most noted by scholars. Realizing how hostility toward Indians was constructed and maintained through depictions of infanticide reveals a constitutive reciprocity between the infant and Indian figures. This reciprocity speaks to how extensively the Indian — whom these texts sought to demonize and dismiss — was foundational to evolving notions of white American republican sensibility. And in turn, we can see how that privileged sensibility laid the groundwork for rendering the Indian irredeemably unemotional, and thus incapable of being ruled by a sympathetic nation.

Great White Fathers and Colonial Orphans

As it struggled to articulate an official policy toward Indians, the U.S. government relied on the affect-laden language of childlike vulnerability and dangerous independence that featured so prominently in narratives of Indian captivity. In 1818, a House committee explicitly figured the Indian child as the determinant of the fate of Native Americans, casting native children as Lockean exemplars whose natural pliability would allow them to adopt white American ways:

> In the present state of our country, one of two things seems to be necessary: either that these sons of the forest should be moralized or exterminated. Humanity would rejoice at the former, but shrink with horror from the latter. Put into the hands of their children the primer and the hose, and they will naturally, in time, take hold of the plough; and, as their minds become enlightened and expand, the Bible will be their book, and they will grow up in habits of morality and industry, leave the chase to those whose minds are less cultivated, and become useful members of society.[61]

In the 1820s and 1830s the Supreme Court deployed language determining the fate of Native Americans that vacillated between a desire to make the Indians childlike — Justice Marshall speaks of placing the Cherokee in a "state of pupilage" much like "a ward to his guardian" — and a fear of Indian strength cast as a dangerous stoicism, impermeable to the pain of war and the threat of loss.[62] In *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823) the court sets up, and then dismisses, a vision of a colonial family in which the Indians could be incorporated because of the "character and habits of the people":

> Humanity, however, acting on public opinion, has established, as a general rule, that the conquered shall not be wantonly oppressed, and that their condition shall remain as eligible as is compatible with the objects of the conquest. Most usually, they are incorporated with the victorious nation, and become subjects or citizens of the government with which they are connected. The new and old members of society mingle with each other; the distinction between them is gradually lost, and they make one people. Where this incorporation is practicable, humanity demands, and a wise policy dictates, that the rights of the conquered to property should remain unimpaired; that the new subjects should be governed as equitably as the old, and that confidence in their security should gradually banish the painful sense of being separated from their ancient connexions, and united by force to strangers.[63]

Indians here are figured as orphans, or, in the language of the Court, "new subjects" who, although "separated from their ancient connexions," would nonetheless learn to embrace their colonial parents because of the "confidence" and "security" they would find in the just government provided therein. Like the schoolchildren in the committee report, the Indians should eventually learn their new role in society, and like good students, do their best to make the grade.

However, the Court insists, such a fatherly embrace of "new" native subjects is impossible "because [the Indians] were as brave and as high spirited as they were fierce, and were ready to repel by arms every attempt on their independence." As "fierce savages, whose occupation was war, and whose subsistence was drawn chiefly from the forest," Indians were apparently unsuited for incorporation into the national family, in which they would undoubtedly have to occupy the role of dependent.[64] In 1832, in *Worcester v. State of Georgia*, the Court, again returning to the process through which Indians had become dispossessed of their lands, muses on how often trea-

ties sought to articulate a filial relationship between natives and Europeans. Such documents, not "supposing it to be material whether they [Indians] were called the subjects, or the children of their father in Europe," sought to urge the Indians to "profess their dependence" on the power of such a father.[65]

In *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), the Court creates a diptych of Indians as, alternately, good children or fiercely independent adults. On one side, we see the peace that could come if Indians would only occupy their proper role as colonial children. On the other side, the Indians' inherent inability to occupy their assigned childlike role leaves the conquerors little choice but to utterly destroy them:

> They [Indian tribes] may, more correctly, perhaps, be denominated domestic dependent nations. They occupy a territory to which we assert a title independent of their will, which must take effect in point of possession when their right of possession ceases. Meanwhile they are in a state of pupilage. Their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian. . . . They look to our government for protection; rely upon its kindness and its power; appeal to it for relief to their wants; and address the president as their great father.[66]

Regardless of their assigned dependent status, their "habits" and "signal cruelty" — references that inevitably conjure images of infanticide, among other atrocities — disqualify them for the role of ward:

> Independently of the general influence of humanity, these people were restless, warlike, and signally cruel in their irruptions during the revolution. The policy, therefore, of enticing them to the arts of peace, and to those improvements which war might lay desolate, was obvious; and it was wise to prepare them for what was probably then contemplated, to wit, to incorporate them in time into our respective governments: a policy which their inveterate habits and deep seated enmity has altogether baffled.[67]

Unlike a pliable child who can be trained into obedience, the Indians are the product of "inveterate habits" that have forged a stoic impermeability to both pain and compassion.

The vacillating rhetoric of these decisions illustrates how central notions of childhood had become for the codification of internal colonization and rule. The Indians, precisely because they *cannot* be effectively figured as doc-

ile children — in large part because of a centuries-old rhetorical tradition casting them as the antithesis of such children — cannot be tolerated as internally colonized subjects. Their "fierce independence," in itself emblematic of the stoics many Anglo-Americans sought to emulate, is intolerable within a framework in which white Americans desperately needed to view themselves as the adults.

William Apess and the Voice of the Captive Child

William Apess, Methodist minister, activist, and autobiographer, was well aware of the rhetoric portraying the stoic Indian as perennially unable to properly respond to the civilizing nurturance of the white man. In his 1829 autobiography, *Son of the Forest*, Apess cites Washington Irving's *Sketch-book* as a privileged text in an appendix clearly designed to position him as part of an ongoing literary conversation on Indian identity. Irving's *Sketch-book* contains a nominally friendly description of Indians that actually reinforces the notion that Indians are indelibly fixed within the wild landscape they inhabit, a landscape that renders them stoic and unresponsive:

> There is something in the character and habits of the North American savage, taken in connection with the scenery over which he is accustomed to range, its vast lakes, boundless forests, majestic rivers, and trackless plains, that is, to my mind, wonderfully striking and sublime. He is formed for the wilderness, as the Arab is for the desert. His nature is stern, simple, and enduring, fitted to grapple with difficulties and to support privations. There seems but little soil in his heart for the support of the kindly virtues; and yet, if we would but take the trouble to penetrate through that proud stoicism and habitual taciturnity which lock up his character from casual observation, we should find him linked to his fellow-man of civilized life by more of those sympathies and affections than are usually ascribed to him.[68]

Apess's text attempts to breathe life into Irving's rather half-hearted assertion that Indians are both worthy and capable of sympathy. In his self-fashioning, Apess attempts to disavow the role of the fiercely independent Indian stoic — a role with deadly consequences, as Justice Marshall's assertions make clear. In order to do so, Apess must craft a vision of himself that allows him to be recognized *as a child* by his readers. As I've discussed, both in the twisted logic of the captivity narrative and in the language of

the Supreme Court, the notion that Indians were irrevocably independent adults rendered them unrecoverable through the discourses of colonial sympathy. Because they could not be positioned as colonial children, the logic ran, they must be destroyed, or at the very least, removed. To align oneself with a child might seem a risky move for any member of a population seeking to find political voice. But in the literary matrix in which Apess writes, his decision to align himself with a child does not simply reinforce the logic of infantilization. Instead, by creating an Indian protagonist who can occupy the emotionally powerful literary figure of the child victim, Apess forges an Indian subjectivity that works against the rhetoric of the captivity narrative, the ethnographer, and the Supreme Court itself.

As a writer keenly aware of the currency of contemporary literary modes, Apess seeks to place himself within the overlapping frameworks of childhood available to him. He first embodies the victimized child of the captivity narrative. He then moves on to the languishing child of the conversion narrative. In the process, he tacitly acknowledges the rhetorical and affective power of the child figure. His portrayal of the suffering child, however, differs sharply from the child's depiction in the texts he engages. Rather than invoking scenes of suffering childhood (in this case, his own) merely to wring tears from white adults, he reveals the devastation wrought by the infantilizing logic of those adults. By giving the symbolic suffering child of captivity, of slave narratives, and even of sentimentalized white childhood a voice, Apess undoes the tidy structures of power and exploitation built on the figure of the voiceless victimized child.

Laura Donaldson writes that Apess's desire to position himself as a recognizably "literary" writer places him within a "postcolonial reality somewhere between relentless victimization and outright confiscation — or between resistance and complicity."[69] Donaldson taps into an ongoing debate about the authenticity of Apess's voice, mediated as it is through the allegedly colonizing framework of white literacy and religion. In her analysis, Donaldson seeks to understand Apess's tactics within the theoretical bounds articulated by the concept of mimicry. As Homi Bhabha has written, and many postcolonial critics have echoed, mimicry — in which the native reflects the image of the colonizer, but not exactly — works to undo the notion of an authoritative original. "The menace of mimicry," Bhabha suggests, "is its double vision, which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority."[70]

But mimicry, as Arnold Krupat and many others have suggested, has limited efficacy as a mode of resistance. Examining Apess's embrace of Christianity, as well as his immersion in white literary culture, Krupat argues that in Apess's case "there is the implication that when the Native lost his land, he lost his voice as well."[71] Maureen Konkle, in response, argues that to read Native American literature with the expectation that it pass a litmus test of authenticity is to engage in a maneuver similar to the colonizing processes Apess protested so eloquently. As Konkle writes, "Apess rejects the notion of an innate Indian consciousness because he understands that positing inherent difference between Indians and Europeans is a crucial step in denying Indians' political status."[72]

There is a third option between the canny subversion that critics like to ascribe to marginalized writers, and the wholesale acceptance of the colonizer's logic that others have seen in Apess. The power of his narrative comes not from his *inability* to occupy the position of suffering child, but from the fact that he does so perfectly. To return to Bhabha, who says that mimicry always involves an excess and a difference, I suggest that Apess intentionally resists playing on that difference. In *Son of the Forest*, Apess does not attribute his horrible childhood solely to his racial status — something he does explicitly in his later text, *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians*. Instead, he positions his suffering as the possible lot of *any* unprotected child in order to make a larger point about childhood in general, or rather the affective and political damage wrought by current representations of childhood. Simply by speaking as the suffering child — a subject position that is defined, in part, by its lack of voice — Apess exposes the dangers and injustices facing *any* person on whom white conceptions of childhood dependence are imposed.

Apess moves through the white narratives that account for childhood to reveal how those narratives are untenable. By telling the story of the suffering child, he reveals the false promise that made the trope increasingly popular — that by occupying a pitiable position one will receive the care one needs. Instead, the tragedy of his childhood comes from learning that the role of dependent child does not lead to love, or even to the security Justice Marshall promises in his legal decision. Rather it requires a constant reperformance of vulnerability. Thus, while he certainly does reveal the damage wrought on native culture by whites, Apess deftly moves across color lines to undermine the logic of infantilization

that facilitates the subjugation of several segments of the early American populace.

The first step in Apess's literary call for recognition is to find a way to position himself as an identifiable child. The captivity narrative, among other representations, excluded Indians from the emotional pliancy of childhood, rendering them utterly unwilling to ask for mercy, or to extend it to another. Apess directly engages with the captivity narrative and speaks in the voice of the brutalized child figure that the genre fetishizes and silences. In the process, he undoes both sides of the captivity equation. By chronicling his own vulnerability, he disavows the stereotype of the hard-hearted Indian stoic. By rendering the plight of the besieged child of the captivity narrative in the first person, he recalibrates the emotional machinery that pushes the captivity story forward.

Apess pointedly speaks of his treatment among the white community as analogous to captivity. As Hillary Wyss argues, Apess "inverts the traditional captivity narrative to point out his own victimization at the hands of his savage white masters."[73] However, it is important to remember that the beginning of Apess's narrative (when he is being cared for by his Indian grandparents) correlates with the traditional captivity narrative in jarring ways. Apess restages the drama of the captivity narrative in his own childhood home. Apess, like countless white child victims, occupies the role of a fragile child terrorized by native adults who are heedless of his tears. Apess pointedly explains that the abuse he endures at the hands of his Indian grandmother was the product of the whites' corruption of native culture. Yet his poignant and detailed description of the mistreatment he suffered cannot help but conjure up the scenes of physical abuse that the child of the captivity narrative endures in countless tracts. In one case, his grandmother's merciless beating of four-year-old William evokes the captivity narrative's tableau of a cruel torturer who is unmoved by the tears of a child:

> [She] returned in a state of intoxication, and without any provocation whatsoever on my part, began to belabor me most unmercifully with a club; she asked me if I hated her, and I very innocently answered in the affirmative, as I did not then know what the word meant, and thought I was answering aright; and so she continued asking me the same question, and I as often answered her in the same way, whereupon she continued beating me, by which means one of my arms was broken in three different places.[74]

Apess's account mirrors the captivity narrative's iconic suffering of a child, but the affective energy of the passage is redirected. Rather than channeling the scene's emotion through a white adult who is witnessing the inarticulate pain of a young child, Apess foregrounds the perspective of the child himself. The reader is effectively placed in the victim's position, rather than in the onlooker's role, and as victim, becomes subject to baffling, incomprehensible demands by an unreasonable and brutal authority figure.

Apess's recounting of this scene deftly merges several racialized definitions of childhood to illustrate the damning implications of the child's function as an emotion-laden marker of cultural clashes. In addition to the formulaic captivity tableau in which heartless Indians harm fragile white youths, this scene evokes the emerging antislavery scenario in which a small dark body is corporeally punished by an unfeeling adult (a dynamic I discuss at length in chapter 4). As Richard Brodhead has argued persuasively, the scene of the whipped dark child in the antebellum United States was inextricably linked with a larger discourse about corporal punishment in which the Lockean-inspired ideal of nonviolent "disciplinary intimacy" was compared with the brutality — and inefficacy — of beatings.

This scene of a child being hurt also taps into a third formulation of childhood — one no less dependent on the child's suffering than the racialized portraits of white infants' deaths and slave children's tears. The dialogue exchanged between grandmother and grandson also crosses into another rendition of childhood, one most often applied to a privileged white child. The grandmother's frenzied demands for love, I suggest, emerge as a twisted parody of the white child's increasingly sentimentalized role in domestic discourse. A generation before *A Son of the Forest* was written, captivity narratives featured grief-stricken mothers who would do anything to save their child from suffering. A generation after Apess's book was published, best-selling novels would feature a transcendently intense woman-child bond as their center. Novels such as Susan Warner's 1850 *Wide Wide World*, Stowe's 1852 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and others helped to articulate the nineteenth century's investment in motherhood and the mother-child bond. It is the promise of such a bond that is most violently broken in Apess's description of the altercation between his grandmother and himself as a four-year-old boy. In a pivotal scene of his childhood, Apess's focus on his grandmother's insistent and unanswerable question illuminates the problematic emerging cultural assertion that the child must be both the giver and the receiver of uncondi-

tional, all-fulfilling love. The beating, after all, ostensibly occurs because the young William does not profess his love for his grandmother in the manner she desires. In Apess's volatile portrait of the revered woman-child bond, the grandmother's insistent questions about whether young William hates her renders an unspoken set of rules terrifyingly explicit. In this violent vision of woman-child exchange, the child's role is to affirm, even create, good feelings in the adult interlocutor even through his own suffering. The vision of domestic bliss in which child and mother are rapt in mutual love — a vision instantiated by the captivity narrative's tales of mothers driven mad with grief at the severing of the maternal bond — is peeled back to reveal the often-unarticulated terror children experienced at the hands of their caretakers. William's fate reveals the extent to which "filial love" can be enforced through violence.

The aftermath of the beating seems to verify the emotional logic of the captivity narrative: the excessive suffering and pain the four-year-old Apess endures evokes beneficent feelings in the breasts of white onlookers. He is taken in and cared for. However, Apess is careful to dismantle the equivalencies between his story and the captivity narrative. He is quick to respond to the implied reader's horror-filled wonder at "what savages [his] grandparents were to treat unoffending, helpless children in this cruel manner," by arguing that white corruption of native values was what led to such savage treatment. And indeed, the scope of his critique expands beyond the introduction of alcohol and other predatory practices. Rather his entire narrative illustrates how white culture makes any form of childhood — whether physical or political — an untenable position.

Barry O'Connell has demonstrated that William Apess had a remarkably inclusive sense of the plight of the oppressed in Jacksonian America. He often explicitly linked Africans and Indians in his rhetoric (anticipating, as O'Connell points out, our current sense of "people of color"). O'Connell points to Apess's militancy and eloquence as evidence of a "developing culture of dissent among New England Indians, African Americans and very possibly some poor whites."[75] Apess's canny use of the suffering child's plasticity in representing the plight of all three marginalized populations (Indians, blacks, and white children) reflects a keen sense of the structures that systematically denied most people access to power over their own lives and labor. Apess's careful deployment of the racially charged figure of the suffering child ultimately testifies to Anglo-American culture's failure to

address the wants of its most vulnerable members: his portrayal of adults' incessant exploitation of vulnerability critiques the increasingly foundational Western binary of self-reliant adult and utterly dependent child — a binary continually reinstantiated through scenes in which the vulnerability of childhood is equal to a death sentence.

The disdainful American vision of dependency that dooms the young Apess to a life of hardship contrasts sharply with the reciprocal exchange between power and weakness that characterized many traditional Native American relationships in southern New England. As Hillary Wyss, Laura Bragdon, and others have suggested, the position of vulnerable subject was essential to maintaining power relations in these societies. As Bragdon writes, the physically weaker and more vulnerable of the tribe would acknowledge their position through humility but were confident that "in exchange for deferential behavior, or by virtue of their status as 'petitioners,' their requests would be granted."[76] Vulnerability and dependence in this model, then, gives one a degree of power, and a position from which one can claim rights and privileges. As Apess continually points out how adults have failed him, he builds an implicit argument wherein dependence constitutes a legitimate claim on those who are in a position to provide care and guidance. The behavior of Apess's grandparents, and later, of his white patrons, reveals the damage done when vulnerability becomes a liability, rather than a claim on the obligations of those currently in a stronger position.

Once Apess is removed from his grandparents' house to the Furmans' home, he embodies the image of the traumatized Indian orphan evoked by the Supreme Court. Removed from what Justice Marshall might have called his "ancient connexions," he is charged, like the conquered natives Marshall described in 1823, to find "security" in the justice administered by this new form of authority and government. In many ways, Apess's time among the white community can be read as a series of desperate attempts to do just that — to prove that he is not a recalcitrant Indian who defies the role of dependent. The tragedy comes in the realization that occupying the role of vulnerable, dependent child — the role that was denied to Indians in both the captivity narrative and in legal documents — garners Apess neither love nor protection, but rather continued abuse and a virtual form of slavery.

Apess again positions himself as the besieged child of the captivity narrative as he describes his time among whites. Perhaps the most striking reference to the captivity narrative emerges in his description of the fear he felt

when, on a berry-picking expedition with his white family, he looks on white women whose skin is, "to say the least, as *dark* as that of the natives" (11). The sight of these "dark" women emerging from the woods evokes the archetypal scene in the captivity narrative in which a white family is removed from its everyday environment to endure a torturous forced march through the wilderness. Apess is so terrified at the sight that he runs from the scene, unable to "muster courage enough to look behind until I had reached home" (11). As in his description of his grandparents' abuse, Apess is careful to illustrate how the caricature of the savage Indian is the product of whites who also hold themselves aloof from the pleas of those more vulnerable than they. "The great fear I entertained of my brethren," he writes, "was occasioned by the many stories I had heard of their cruelty toward the whites," stories, he points out, that insisted that Indians "were in the great majority the aggressors" (12).

As with his time with his grandmother, Apess's time with the Furmans and others is marked by violence born of the adult's inability to view the young Apess beyond the dual subject positions offered by the captivity narrative — either as a dangerously impermeable Indian or a perpetually suffering child. When a girl in the Furman household harbors a grudge against Apess and tells Mr. Furman that he had chased her with a knife, Furman immediately attacks Apess despite the child's urgent protests. As Apess's grandmother did, Furman makes up his mind about Apess's alleged transgression; what Apess himself says is of no consequence. Much like the child's pain in the standard captivity narrative, Apess's pain is necessary for the action to continue, and his feelings are continually interpreted as beyond adult understanding. Apess insists on revealing the injustice of such a scene, telling the reader that the "poor man soon found out his error, as after he flogged me he undertook to investigate the matter," thereby discovering his charge's innocence (12).

Rhetorically linking his native grandmother and the white Furmans clarifies Apess's earlier assertion that whites were to blame for his grandmother's shocking abuse of a four-year-old child. By setting up his grandmother's crime as an initial step in a spiraling cycle of events in which a host of adults continue to ignore, misread, and mistreat the young Apess, he reveals that her crime was not unique. Rather, she is at fault because she surrendered native ways to white influence. Certainly, her alcoholism was the product of white culture's devastating inroads. But her treatment of dependents pro-

vides perhaps the most striking evidence of white influence. By refusing to take care of the vulnerable members of her household, and by physically abusing them, she is acting like a white man — as the catalog of exploitative and abusive white men that follows illustrates.

In addition to the suffering child of captivity, Apess also inhabits the role of the suffering child saint immortalized in James Janeway's wildly popular *Token for Children*. In doing so, he participates in a standing tradition that casts Indians in the role of child martyrs to prove their sensibility. Christian missionaries often sought to illustrate the Indians' potential to inhabit the permeable position of Christian converts by explicitly placing their subjects in the framework perfected by James Janeway in his compendium of piously expiring children. Laura Stevens has argued that Protestant missionaries faced with the alterity of Indian culture had to cultivate a sense of pity for the perceived Indian suffering they saw.[77] I would add that the missionary enterprise had two simultaneous attitudes toward the suffering of their charges. On one hand, as Stevens rightly points out, missionaries like Experience Mayhew, David Brainerd, John Sargent and others did see their work as alleviating suffering. Yet, the very structure of the conversion narrative demands cultivating suffering as a means to grace. Indian distress must be represented as a means of securing pity — and through pity, funds and support abroad. Yet it is that very distress — their very ability to suffer — that qualifies Indians for redemption in the first place. Their spiritual and physical pain is a token of their ability to receive the grace that so often accompanied redemption.[78]

Missionary material written in the mold cast by Janeway's tales of pious child deaths explicitly promotes the Indians' ability to suffer. The missionary David Brainerd, who himself speaks of being moved by Janeway's tales in his journal, was undoubtedly influenced by the model of piety he found there. Experience Mayhew's 1727 *Christian Converts* devotes an entire section to "Pious Children." All of Mayhew's stories share Janeway's plot trajectory: the subjects are first touched by grace, they sicken, and they eventually die. And as with Janeway's child martyrs, the suffering and death these individuals experience seem to directly result from religious experience. According to Mayhew, little Bethia Tuphaus is moved to prayer and piety by the sight of her suffering father. "When she was but a little above three Years old," Mayhew explains, "her good Father being very sick, and nigh to Death, her Mother saw her kneeling down in the Room where he lay, and

soon perceived that she was speaking and praying to God."[79] Her childish speech, as related by her mother, and then transcribed by Mayhew, falls within the established formula for conversion. She "confess[es] her Sins, and utter Unworthiness to speak to the Lord: and [she asks him] to have Mercy on, and pardon and save her."[80] She dies less than a year later.

Another child exemplar, Job Tuphaus, the brother of Bethia, embodies the improbable perfection Janeway attributed to an impressively pious — and therefore inevitably doomed — child: "He seemed, when he was but a Child, to stand in awe that he sinned not; was not, as did appear, given to any of those Vices that the Generality of Boys are addicted to."[81] In addition to the awe-inspiring ability to remain sinless, the young Tuphaus was also "very willing and desirous to go to Meeting, and seemed loth to omit any Opportunity of attending the publick Duties of Religion. He was also very careful to attend Family Worship, and seemed to be very serious in it."[82] Tuphaus's pious inner state, first made manifest by his behavior, is eventually confirmed by his body's willingness to follow the path of suffering and early death fetishized by Christian narratives.

The imposition of Janeway's model of childhood pain on the experiences of Indian children rendered suffering childhood a key site of transcultural exchange between English settlers and natives. In the process, of course, these narratives helped to convert the suffering that actual children experienced — suffering often caused by the colonizers' introduction of disease, alcoholism, and attendant family disintegration — into a wholly spiritual narrative that posits the missionaries as saviors, and the child's suffering and death as *evidence* of their salvific work. Apess himself was aware of the tradition, most clearly articulated in Mrs. Furman's reiteration of Janeway's repeated insistence that children should see death lurking around every corner. In a typical intervention, Janeway would grab his child reader's wandering attention with the terrors of the grave: "Did thou never hear of a Little Child that Died? And if other Children die, why may not you be sick and die? And what will you do then, Child, if you should have no grace in your heart? . . . And are you willing to go to Hell to Be Burned with the Devil and his Angels?"[83] Mrs. Furman uses Janeway's model on at least one occasion with young Apess: "On this occasion, she spoke to me respecting a future state of existence and told me that I might die and enter upon it, to which I replied that I was too young — that old people only died. But she assured me that I was not too young, and in order to convince me of the truth of

the observation, she referred me to the graveyard, where many younger and smaller persons than myself were laid to molder in the earth" (9). It seems that such exhortations had the effect that Janeway describes. Much like the children in Janeway's book, and in Mayhew's missionary accounts, Apess experiences a spiritual awakening followed by a striking illness.

Apess's emphasis on his own mysterious sickness writes him into the very narrative of suffering childhood grace that had been earlier used by missionaries to argue that Indians were not hard-hearted stoics but rather individuals able to experience Christian conversion, and by extension, assimilation into white Christian culture. And certainly Apess invites the audience to read his illness as rich in supernatural meaning. "The disease with which I was afflicted" he relates, "was a very curious one. The physician could not account for it, and how should I be able to do it? Neither had those who were about me ever witnessed any disorder of the kind" (13). In portraying his case as enigmatic, Apess again echoes the genre created by Janeway in which the child-exemplars are continually portrayed as wondrously extraordinary.[84] Tellingly, Apess's illness once again returns him to a state of pitiable vulnerability that *should* guarantee care. Confined to his bed, as he was after his grandmother's brutal beating of him, Apess is once again dependent on the Furmans to nurse him back to health. But the Furmans, it seems, are less willing to embrace Apess's spiritually inflected illness than they were to take up the child nearly killed by native "savagery." Apess tells us that he was a "great deal of trouble for the family, as someone had to be with me" (13). It is not immediately clear why Apess's illness necessitates the constant presence of a family member. Perhaps he felt — and was able to convince the family — that death was imminent. But his juxtaposition of his persistent feeling of suffocation and the need for a caretaker to be present suggests that part of what ailed him was a feeling of profound loneliness and vulnerability.

Laura Donaldson has called Apess's illness "colonial hysteria" — the "interaction of Pequot mind and body in the context of Euro-American imperialism."[85] I'm not willing to assert, as Donaldson does, that Apess's illness was primarily a psychosomatic phenomenon. We simply cannot know whether or not Apess suffered from a pulmonary obstruction or disease. This illness, like the "apoplexy" that will end Apess's life, can never be satisfactorily diagnosed.[86] Whatever caused his illness, however, surely such an illness *could* be read as worthy of praise and acceptance in his community. Certainly

that's the case for the children anthologized in transnational deathbed stories. After realizing the futility of inhabiting the role of the child of captivity whose sole role is to suffer, and to elicit appropriate emotional responses from adults, Apess's self-representation changes to place him within another narrative in which a child's suffering offers another path to adult care and approval.

In many ways, Apess's illness can be seen as a way of demanding the care and concern that he had so often found lacking. Yet, as so many times before, Apess's insertion of himself into a narrative of suffering childhood — a subject position that *should* generate sympathy and acceptance, and allow him to escape the fate of the stoic Indian — reveals that the role of suffering child offers no redemption. Within the structures of thought that Apess outlines in the narrative, there are three ways of properly addressing this illness. First, one could follow the popular literary trajectory of the child martyr, started by Janeway, and followed by Mather, Mayhew, and others. If one reads Apess according to this storyline, his pain would emerge as a physical manifestation of his own conversion. On a more quotidian level, one might read the child's illness as an everyday occurrence in an era in which illness and pain were inevitable components of life. At the very least then, the child would necessitate care to aid in his recovery. Finally, there is room for reading his illness as a product of great anxiety. There was an ample allowance of the mind-body connection in eighteenth-century medical texts.

The reading Apess's suffering body receives, however, is one that relegates childhood pain to an unknowable and unreachable phenomenon. Like Apess's grandmother, Furman sees the child as something hateful that can be altered only by violent intervention. Asserting that it was the devil inside of Apess — rather than the grace Janeway might suggest, or at least the spiritual crisis that seems apparent — Furman turns to the rod to alter Apess's state. Furman waits until the family has gone to bed, and Apess is alone, and then gives the child a "dreadful whipping" (13). By emphasizing the beatings he receives both from an oppressed older native woman and a respectable male member of the white community, Apess collapses the moral distance between the two adults, a moral distance the rest of the community insists on. Their treatment of Apess — treatment he clearly wants us to see as cruel and unjust — reflects an overarching structure of belief in which a child exists as something devoid of its own interior, but instead works to reflect the

emotional state of adults. By insisting that these very different adults are equally wrongheaded, Apess illustrates the flaws in such a system.

Apess once again merges the discourses of white, black, and Indian childhood when he describes his anguish at being sold without his consent. Anti-Indian prejudice likely played a part in the Furmans' willingness to believe that somehow Apess was incorrigible and was not worthy of the effort to reform his bad behavior. And that is precisely the reading Apess offers in his 1833 work *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians*, when he explicitly blames white bigotry for his plight: "I was alone in the world, fatherless, motherless, and helpless, as it were, and none to speak for the poor little Indian boy. Had my skin been white, with the same abilities, and the same parentage, there could not have been found a place good enough for me."[87] However, in *A Son of the Forest*, Apess narrates the event in a way that accommodates several readings that, taken together, allow for a critique of the intense helplessness white society inflicts on anyone forced into the dependent subject position of childhood.

Apess's recounting of being sold without his consent, or even his knowledge, parallels a narrative that would become central to slave narratives in which children are sold away on a moment's notice (and which I discuss in greater detail in chapter 4). His tale also resonates with the experience of Indian children who had to endure separation from their parents in order to receive the "education" that whites insisted was necessary.[88] Finally, Apess's unhappy experience as an apprentice with Judge Hillhouse echoes the experience of many white children (Benjamin Franklin among them) who were still subject to difficult apprenticeships. For Apess, this utter discounting of his personhood, with its attendant desire for control of his own life and labor, is the "best means to accomplish the ruin of a child" (15). While he does acknowledge his own sins against the Furmans, he rests the blame for the trouble that follows squarely in adult hands.

The result of Apess's triangulation between the standard captivity narrative and alternate visions of captivity (once held by his grandparents, and once held by white Christians) is a reconfiguration of the racialized child victim that occupies the center of the captivity genre. In short, William Apess insists that the versions of childhood that have become elaborated through colonial discourse comparing children with Indians, blacks, and other marginalized groups create a dead end for both the child and the marginalized adult. Apess's remembered child victim still evokes vulnerabil-

ity, and perhaps even still elicits tears from sympathetic onlookers. But as his moves from native captivity to childhood conversion to apprenticeship reveal, the ethnic makeup of the adults was less important than the fact that they were, in fact, adults. Inhabiting a metaphorical child that worked to infantilize adult blacks, Indians, and disempowered whites, Apess reappropriates the role of vulnerable subject to illustrate how extensively the role of the independent (white) adult depended on the suffering of a host of dependent children. He consciously places himself in the trope of a suffering child in ways that cut across race to indict the larger belief system that lent the parent-child metaphors such power in legal and personal practice.

Taken as a whole, Apess's narrative seeks to turn another child-centered genre on its head. His narrative mimics the juvenile advice literature that was growing in popularity — only in *Son of the Forest*, the advice comes from a child and is aimed at adults who are clearly in need of education. Apess's familiarity with the juvenile advice genre emerges most clearly in his 1833 piece *Experiences of Five Christian Indians*. In this text, Apess engages in a direct address to children that appears in many contemporary juvenile texts, and certainly echoes much of James Janeway's pioneering *Tokens for Children*. In *Experiences*, Apess, like Janeway, repeatedly stops the narrative to directly address his child readers, guiding their responses to his story. Following this centuries-old formula, Apess points out the oversights and mistakes of youth, and then follows them up with direct advice about how best to reform. "When you read this," he admonishes, "ask yourself if you have ever had such trials. If not, begin now to prize your privileges and show pity to those whose fates are wretched and cruel."[89] The child reader is told how to feel about the story he or she has just read and receives instruction about what to do with that feeling.

The narrator of *A Son of the Forest* directs his moral asides for the instruction of literal and figurative *parents*, rather than children. At particularly painful moments in his childhood, Apess explicitly blames his caretakers for their failure to properly read the situation, or a child's needs. His foster father's attempt to flog an illness out of him was "as fruitless as the preceding threat in the accomplishment of his object" (14). Apess continually works against the grain of adult readings, frequently pointing out how often the adults around him simply got it wrong. "It may not be improper to remark," Apess writes, "that a vast proportion of the misconduct of young people in church is chargeable to their parents and guardians" (9). But it is not just

at church that parents and guardians damage their charges. In addition to explicitly pointing out that the punishments inflicted on him were wholly unjust, he editorializes on other parenting decisions. When Mrs. Furman "talks seriously" to Apess, by telling him that he had done wrong and by giving "wholesome advice," Apess is quick to tell us that this respectful treatment "had a much better effect than forty floggings" (11). Conversely, he points out the devastation wrought by Mr. Furman's decision to sell Apess without consulting his wishes. "This," Apess insists, "I conceive to be the best means to accomplish the ruin of a child," adding that the reader "will see in the sequel" the effects of such adult disregard of a child's feelings (15). The child here, precisely because he is so vulnerable to suffering, is in an authoritative position to instruct caretakers in how to better fulfill their duties. By giving voice to the suffering child doomed to perish, Apess ultimately insists on a new vision of the child as a subject capable of dignity and protest — as a son of the forest whose vulnerability does not negate the validity of his claims for justice.

CHAPTER THREE

Pregnancy and the New Birth

Reproduction, Performance, and Infantilizing Republican Mothers

THOMAS PAINE'S UNEASY FUSION of mother and child in the 1783 *American Crisis XIII* reveals anxieties about reproducing the republic:

> Never, I say, had a country so many openings to happiness as this. Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising. Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm. Her conduct regulated by the nicest steps, and everything about her wore the mark of honor. It is not every country (perhaps there is not another in the world) that can boast so fair an origin. Even the first settlement of America corresponds with the character of the revolution. Rome, once the proud mistress of the universe, was originally a band of ruffians. Plunder and rapine made her rich and her oppression of millions made her great. But America need never be ashamed to tell her birth, nor relate the stages by which she rose to empire.[1]

Paine's metaphors of mother and child clash in provocative ways. According to his model, the newly born nation mothers herself into being. Invested with the agency of a modest young woman (capable of taking nice steps and wearing a mark of honor), America seems able to bring about her own birth (of which she need not be ashamed, precisely because it was brought about through her own nice steps and honor). Effectively, mother and child are one and the same: the mother's virtuous actions morph imperceptibly

into the child whose future will embrace those same virtues. Much like the authors of captivity narratives, Paine reflects a desire to align interior virtues with clear, identifiable action. In this case, however, the relationship between inner life and outer manifestation strains the boundaries of the individual. Unable to trace the means through which a fully independent identity can be generated, Paine makes his subject do double duty as both the child and the parent, leaving us unsure how to envision the process, or product, of such a "fair origin."

Like Paine, and like the Indian captivity narratives I discuss in the first half of this book, the American seduction novel of the late eighteenth century sought to navigate the proper boundaries between feeling and virtue.[2] The heroine of the seduction novel, after all, navigated a world where outer appearances often did not line up with hidden intentions. Hannah Foster's 1797 *The Coquette* and Susannah Rowson's 1791 *Charlotte Temple* sought to solve the problem of untrustworthy appearances by juxtaposing their deceitful heroines with ephemeral infants-to-be that ultimately reveal their mother's hidden sins. In doing so, they tap into the same conflicted metaphor that Paine does. In both texts, the line between woman and child becomes irredeemably blurred as pregnancy dismantles the heretofore autonomous and unreadable female body.

The American seduction novel has traditionally been read either as an allegory for a young nation yearning for independence amid the bonds of sympathy or as an exploration of female agency in a patriarchal society. As critics such as Cathy Davidson, Gillian Brown, and C. Leiren Mower have argued, these texts are deeply concerned with the struggle of a young woman to control the dispensation of her own body in a patriarchal society. But what few critics have noted is that these novels' ending focus on a female *pregnant* body actually vexes the ideal of Lockean self-possession to which the heroines allegedly aspire.

When we place pregnancy at the center of the analysis of these novels, we find a vacillating investment in Enlightenment thinking and Great Awakening theology that leaves us with a model akin to Paine's wishful, but confused, desire for a sinless birth for a nation that turned against its colonial mother. Lingering to admonish, and perhaps admire, the dangerous performativity of both the rakes and the heroines who fall prey to them, these novels tap into emerging medical definitions of parturition and Great

Awakening notions of the "new birth" to create a portrait of pregnancy that renders deceptive white women utterly transparent and childlike. Through its attention to pregnancy, a deeply provocative process for a nation working to defend its own unusual conception and birth, the seduction novel advances a vision of motherhood that subjugates women's reason to the logic of the body and positions the fetus as a disciplinary agent who reveals and transforms the interior of its mother.

The emphasis on pregnancy in *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette* changes the nature of the literary battle from *Clarissa*'s story of a young woman who rebels against a tyrannical father to a conflict between a deceived — and deceptive — woman and the "truth" her pregnant body will eventually tell. Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* — a best-seller in the colonies in the pivotal year of 1775, and an inspiration for Rowson and Foster — provided a key imaginative template for a colonial child wishing to extricate itself from Mother England.[3] One element of the text that lent itself to such a reading was Clarissa's perpetual status as a besieged daughter, rather than as a mother. *Clarissa* merely hints at the possibility that the heroine might be pregnant. While both her seducer and her tyrannous family have their suspicions, Clarissa herself never provides an answer. She orchestrates her own death too quickly and too meticulously for her body to betray any information she wishes to keep private.[4]

In both *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple*, however, it is precisely the heroines' undeniable pregnancy and ultimately disastrous childbearing that drives the plot to its tragic conclusion. Their unruly interiors become increasingly visible, and legible, as their bodies testify against the mind's supposed agency. The fetuses here — like those torn from the wombs of suffering women in Indian captivity narratives — function as hyperbolic renderings of a woman's hidden interior. But rather than just catalyzing the woman's proper emotional response by its destruction, the fetus in these texts acts as an antagonist — as an outside force that lays claim to a woman who dared to maintain a sense of independence largely reserved for white males. In a moment when political, legal, and medical trends were converging to imbue white middle- and upper-class women with entry to possible equality, these books draw from religious rhetoric to fashion the fetus as a force that transforms women from consenting adult agents to transparent childlike vessels.

Motherhood in Early America

As I discuss in my first chapter, colonial life invested children with particular value — promotional materials actively petitioned for children to buttress the labor force. Yet children were also a site of great risk — their creole status laid open the possibility that new generations would reflect the allegedly savage influences of the American environment. Not surprisingly, questions about who got to be a mother, and under what circumstances, became the subject of intense legal scrutiny as the colonies grew into a nation. Marriage and motherhood helped to create the sense of privacy central to the development of liberal democracy, and its attendant (if illusory) division between public and private spheres. For Elizabeth Dillon, women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were "defined as essentially (biologically, ontologically) *prepolitical* beings whose very bodies and psyches preclude them from attaining the independence necessary for entry-level competence in the liberal political arena." Female bodies, Dillon explains, were "described as insufficiently bounded; the penetrable female body is understood to be inherently lacking in autonomy, joined to children and dependent upon men."[5] The construction of the white female body as helplessly encumbered by its reproductive capacity was necessary to create the ideal, autonomous male subject who would emerge as *the* citizen in liberal theory. As Wendy Brown has written, the liberal formulation of liberty is not just opposed to "but premised upon encumbrance; it is achieved by displacing the embodied, encumbered, and limited nature of existence onto women. . . . [T]he putative autonomy of the liberal subject partakes upon a myth of masculinity requiring the disavowal of dependency, the disavowal of the relations that nourish and sustain this subject."[6]

This division of political labor was not without its glitches. The effects of Lockean philosophy, legal practice, and medical discoveries threatened to invest women's reproductive lives with meanings other than encumbrance and dependence. By the time *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple* were published, controls on women's sexuality — and the children that sexuality might produce — were shifting. Political, scientific, and legal trends were converging in ways that threatened to render white women agents in the reproductive process — a status that could potentially place them on the adult side of the Lockean continuum.

Force, Consent, and Sexual Secrets

The violence surrounding questions of pregnancy and infancy in *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple* takes a different path than it does in the Indian captivity narrative — more circuitous and implicit, but still effective in policing the boundaries of race, class, and gender. Two of the most popular novels of early America feature dying pregnant women at a moment when women of color were being explicitly excluded from the allegedly transformative experience of motherhood. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, violence faced many women before, during, and after the reproductive process. In Clarissa's case, and in the cases of many other real-life victims of coerced "seduction," the act of conception itself was an act of violence. On another register, in regions of North America steeped in the Puritan-inflected desire to expose and rectify the hidden sins of every member of the community, policing sex and reproduction was a process marked with violent punishment. In early New England, drastic public punishments for fornication (often discovered through pregnancy) rendered childbearing and childbirth a fraught process indeed. Cornelia Hughes Dayton's analysis of the New Haven colony, for instance, indicates that fornication and "lascivious carriage" often resulted in "severe whipping or steep fines."[7] Adultery — often "proven" through a suspicious pregnancy — in the colony was a capital offense until 1672, when the punishment was reduced to a severe whipping and branding with the letter *A*, which Hawthorne would immortalize in *The Scarlet Letter*. In seventeenth-century Connecticut, however, there would be no chance to follow Hester's appropriation of the symbol by embroidering the scarlet *A* with fanciful needlework. In New Haven, the letter was scarlet because it was branded into the offender's flesh.

Given what many women faced upon discovery, they sometimes committed violence themselves in an attempt to escape detection. As the sermons and pamphlets on infanticide trials indicate, the spectacle of an infanticidal woman captured the imagination of New Englanders obsessed with discovering secret sin and penetrating the interiors of sinners. Elizabeth Dillon's study of infanticide in the early eighteenth century details the case of Esther Rogers, who at first is strikingly unemotional about both the dead child and the child's father. The community is stymied by Rogers's inability to "open her mind or her condition at all; nor make any other answer to Questions propounded."[8] As scholars have pointed out, Puritan ministers felt an ur-

gent need to read backward from infanticide to a certain sort of sinful interior, and then to read forward to a sinner's remorse and redemption. Esther eventually learns to follow a script describing her feelings — feelings that were either hidden or undeveloped — until the birth and death of her child made them manifest.

In the eighteenth century, changes in both the administration and the aim of punishment articulated different kinds of relations between a woman and a fetus, according to the race and class of the woman in question. For white women, shifts in attitude increasingly rendered them the sole responsible party in illicit sex. Dayton, for one, sees the Richardsonian ideal manifested in the legal practice of Connecticut (where *The Coquette* takes place). "Although the feminine ideal of a chaste, ever-resisting Pamela took hold in all corners of the Anglo-American world," Dayton writes, "the transformation emerged in sharpest relief in the New-England colonies."[9] Earlier in the century, both men and women were prosecuted for breaking the boundaries the community set upon courtship and sexual behavior. In the early days of the Connecticut colony at least, being a rake came at some legal and financial cost. A two-pound penalty was assigned to young men convicted of "inveagl[ing] . . . the affections of any Maide . . . whether it be by speech, writing, message, company-keeping . . . [or] gifts."[10] But by the 1740s, men were rarely prosecuted for sexual crimes — the responsibility for women's chastity fell squarely on women. Whereas earlier in the century, a woman who repeatedly named her lover in court proceedings could feel relatively sure that the man would confess — or if not, be convicted by the community — from the 1740s to the 1790s that assurance was lost. Women's words simply were not enough to implicate men. The infant produced by illicit sex no longer became irrefutable evidence that would uncover the sin that produced it but was instead a floating signifier of the mother's transgression that left the details of the act largely unspoken and unknown.

The double standard of legal prosecution was aimed at rigidly controlling women's sexuality while winking at male misbehavior. But the result also effectively placed women as the sole keepers of sexual secrets — and of the children those secrets often produced. Under the new set of laws, middle-class white women could, and did, raise children without a public acknowledgment of the father, thus disrupting the idea of a father's power and necessity. Because the mother-to-be had little incentive to disclose her private dealings, the male contribution to the child's existence remained a

conspicuous absence. Rather than a vessel designed to produce heirs to the male line, women emerged as the sole legal transgressor, and thus, in effect, the sole parent of a child. Dayton details one particularly interesting case in which, in spite of substantial evidence, a woman's reticence to name her lover basically negated his role in producing her child. Although she herself underwent severe penalties for her transgression (she was whipped and branded with a hot iron), the man involved was effectively erased. In a striking move away from the colonial era's remarkable ability to elicit confessions from both men and women about their secret lives, Sarah Smith and her lover John Guy both denied his role in her pregnancy, even though several people testified to witnessing the two in extremely compromising situations (lying in bed together naked, for instance). Guy was never prosecuted, and Smith and the child lived their lives in New Haven on their own.[11] While the law certainly set out to shame women like Smith, it also invested her with remarkable power to maintain silence about her sexual activities. Although her pregnancy inevitably testified to a sexual transgression, the law's turn away from eliciting confessions from both male and female participants allowed the details of that transgression to remain privately stowed in Smith's mind.

Partly because of the devaluation of women's words, women of the upper and middle classes were prosecuted less for premarital or extramarital sex as the century progressed. As Dayton points out, "men of the middling and elite ranks grew uncomfortable with the stigma of a fornication confession."[12] One effect of this shift in legal status was the dissipation of the community's power to elicit public confessions from middle- and upper-class men or women about their sexual activities. Although certainly subject to communal surveillance — a dynamic that manifests in *The Coquette*'s female chorus — the new judicial attitude dismantled the satisfying ritual of compelling sinners to publicly own up to their private activities. The rate of out-of-wedlock births continued to climb in the eighteenth century, creating considerable anxiety about the transmission of male power and about the specter of women and children on the public rolls.

While the process of prosecuting sexual transgressions rendered women the keepers of sexual secrets, the process through which sex became legitimate — namely, marriage — was also changing in ways that allowed women to tacitly claim the power of consent. That ability was a prime dividing line between adult and child in post-Lockean theory. As Holly Brewer's work

illustrates, marriage itself became an explicit means of differentiating children from adults. For centuries, elite marriage followed the very pattern that Richardson's Clarissa railed against: they were arrangements created by parents in order to maximize gains in status. Although child marriage was not the norm, it was legal.[13] There were nods to the newlywed's consent, but by definitions that are meaningless by modern-day standards. As Brewer points out, British judges in the 1560s upheld marriages of children who "consented" to marriage at the age of two or three.[14]

The logic underlying such a decision views children as extensions of their parents' wishes. The idea that these young children would rebel against the desires of their parents seemed so unlikely that the "consent" of a two-year-old is equivalent to that of a sixteen-year-old. Because marriage was primarily geared to buttress status, and children's status as the property of their parents was still largely in place, the logic held that children younger than seven could be legally wed. Richard Allestree's *The Whole Duty of Man* provides one of the strongest testaments to a parent's property rights in a child's marriage choices. "Children are so much the goods, the possessions of their Parent," Allestree insists, "they cannot, without a kind of theft, give away themselves without the allowance of those that have a right to them."[15]

The Reformation brought with it a push for stricter regulation of marriage age. One motive for the change came from the desire to make marriage a legal, not a sacramental, event. Shifting ideas about hierarchical government ushered in by the Reformation also lent themselves to rethinking the relationship between parent and child. Brewer, arguing against conventional scholarly wisdom, contends that the move to raise the legal age of marriage actually increased parental power because parents gained more explicit say over what their young children could legally do. I suggest that in either the case of a two-year-old taught to lisp "I do," or that of a sixteen-year-old kept from marrying her chosen swain, the child's consent is constructed through the parent's wishes.

While there are multiple reasons and readings for the increased emphasis on a marital age of consent, there was one unalterable result: marriage became legal "proof" of consenting adulthood. Jan Lewis's work suggests that the postrevolutionary emphasis on marriage as a model for consenting citizens invested wives, and wives-to-be, with considerable political significance. For Lewis, the literature of the era positioned marriage as the school of affection as "[r]epublican theorists endeavored to show how, in a

post-patriarchal world, citizens could govern themselves."[16] The very questions that animate Richardson's *Clarissa*, Rowson's *Charlotte Temple*, and certainly Foster's *The Coquette* — if and how a woman could wield consent like a man — were also a meditation on whether a woman could effectively be distinguished from a child.

Changing legal ideas about white women's role in marriage and reproduction were unfolding in tandem with evolving medical beliefs about pregnancy that invested the mother with considerable power. The understanding of how the fetus was formed was undergoing a revolutionary transformation, in itself not so different than the revolution in thought that insisted that outside influences, rather than innate God-given properties, were responsible for an individual's status. In the mid-eighteenth century many in the scientific and medical community were still coming to grips with Harvey's 1651 doctrine of epigenesis, which applied a sort of *tabula rasa* philosophy to fetal development. The theory of epigenesis was gradually supplanting the classical doctrine of preformation, in which perfectly formed little humans resided in the wombs of their ancestors, waiting for their ordained time to appear. Harvey's scientific discovery took over a century to gain full acceptance, at least partly because of the radical threat it posed to notions of a preordained social order in which an all-knowing God has arranged exactly who will appear when and in which men were the prime movers in regeneration.[17]

The theory of epigenesis posed a serious threat to the notion of a great chain of being, and the patriarchal privilege encoded in that notion. As Eve Keller points out, Harvey's finding that there was no semen in the uterus after intercourse led him to speculate that the embryo was "produced solely by the female" after fertilization.[18] Such a theory was a grave threat to notions of the father's role as the creative force in generation and instead posited the female as the prime mover.[19] Such a finding, Keller argues, shares much with Thomas Hobbes's notion of mother-right. In his attempt to discredit the patriarchal notion that children owe allegiance to their fathers in perpetuity, Hobbes argues that, because of the certainty of one's maternity (as opposed to paternity) and the vital role mothers play in a child's survival, children owe their primary obedience to mothers.[20] For Hobbes, however, such maternal power ends abruptly once an individual gains the autonomy that is his birthright. On another register, the theory of epigenesis, with its emphasis on unformed potential, can be read as an anticipatory biological

version of Locke's theory that human beings are malleable beings shaped by experience. Because a pregnant woman has the sole power to provide the environment and experiences in which the imagined epigenetic fetus unfurls its potential, pregnancy itself emerged as a powerful, and potentially threatening, battleground for patriarchal privilege.

These developments in philosophical, legal, and medical figurations of a woman's sexual role, and her ability to act as a consenting agent in that role, were parsed along the lines of class and race. The ability for a woman to consent — or not — to marriage, sex, and motherhood was a theoretical possibility only for white women of a certain class. As the eighteenth century progressed, and marriage became the provenance of adulthood, that adulthood became the domain of whiteness. In slave states, marriage and legitimate birth were the exclusive domain of white women, usually women of the middle and upper classes. If Puritan ministers faced with Esther Rogers's 1701 infanticide felt they had to provide a script of hidden sin and wrenching remorse to demonstrate the "natural" bond between mother and infant, eighteenth-century legislators in Virginia were working diligently to denaturalize the relationship between enslaved mothers and their children.

Slave masters in North America actively sought to render black women's childbearing and childrearing categorically removed from the privileges of motherhood accorded to white women. Even as North American slave owners knew that reproduction would add to their own profit margin, they insisted on defining African American motherhood in ways that greatly increased the likelihood of infant death. Perhaps they were influenced by accounts like those of William Smith, who on his return from the African Gold Coast remarked on how the act of childbirth had no appreciable physical or emotional affect on the women of the country. A black woman, he tells us, can be "deliver'd of a Child in less than a Quarter of an Hour, and in their Labour they use no Shrieks or Cries; nay the very same Day it is customery for the Lying-in woman to go to the Sea-Side and bathe herself, without ever thinking of returning to her Bed."[21] Indian women were also described as having remarkably pain-free deliveries, in sharp contrast to the travail that attended white women's births.

Poor white women were also excluded from definitions of motherhood accorded to white middle- and upper-class women. Because indentured servants and African slaves were explicitly alienated from the labor of their own bodies, they were denied an acknowledgment of the physical and emotional

ties of motherhood. The children produced by these women were either a devaluation of the woman's labor (for indentured servants who would have to serve extra time to make up for the lost labor of pregnancy and childbirth) or a supplement to it (for African slaves whose children added to the master's property holdings). As Kathleen M. Brown has demonstrated, linking white middle-class women with a particular form of reproduction and childbearing was key to giving her — and her offspring — a privileged position. As I will discuss in my analysis of *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple*, creating an intensely emotional, symbiotic relationship between white women and the reproductive process was also a key element in dismantling those women's growing claims to the role of consenting adult.

Pregnancy in *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette*

Both Susannah Rowson's *Charlotte Temple* and Hannah Foster's *The Coquette* feature women who seek to control their bodies in the marriage marketplace. In a particularly postrevolutionary twist to the Richardsonian paradigm, these novels asked about the role pregnancy and eventual motherhood could have on women's capacity to function within the emerging ideal of a rational, unencumbered citizen. Unable to physically hide their pregnancies, Charlotte and Eliza are also unable to survive the transgression that brought the pregnancy about. In an era when women were increasingly eligible for consideration as an agent in sex and reproduction, these texts invest the fetus with ultimate control over women's bodies.

At their stories' beginnings, both women act as if their bodies are unencumbered by biology, seeking to negotiate and, eventually, consummate romantic attachments without the mediation of their parents. Decidedly unlike children incapable of autonomous consent — and in stark contrast to the devastatingly transparent children of the captivity narrative — both Charlotte and Eliza are able to create distances between their interior feelings and their observable actions. Before their pregnancies, the heroines share Lovelace's knack for performance, often disguising their intentions, or at least their distress, in order to negotiate the treacherous terrain they must travel. As Jay Fliegelman and others have pointed out, the dangers of performance were particularly acute for those who feared the wayward tendencies of a democratic republic. Without the trappings of birthright to provide an interpretive template for one's body and intentions, the possibil-

ity of shifting identities through performance was extremely threatening to a nation that many felt could survive only through the unalloyed virtue of their citizens.[22]

In one of the few analyses that consider pregnancy essential to the early American seduction novel, Jay Fliegelman suggests that the seduction novel seeks to correct the dangerous allure of performance. For Fliegelman, when the fallen heroine of William Hill Brown's 1789 *The Power of Sympathy* runs away and commits suicide in an attempt to escape the "time of explanation," she "reenacts her original sin of believing in an impenetrable private sphere safe from the public eye. The story, like the sin, cannot be hidden in a world where one's face is forever a picture of one's passions."[23]

Yet in both Rowson's and Foster's novels this model does not hold. The drama unfolds precisely because the women are, in fact, very good at keeping their faces from becoming pictures of their passions. Both Eliza and Charlotte are able, at first, to keep their intentions and desire from becoming physically apparent. As a coquette, Eliza, like her male counterpart the rake, wreaks damage by cultivating the disparity between her true intentions and the physical and conversational clues she provides to others. Eliza's ability to convince two men of vastly different temperaments that she is a perfect mate testifies to her ability to perform adeptly.[24] Her personal magnetism depends largely on her ability to read the physical cues of others and provide them with the persona they wish to see. She is able to simultaneously encourage the virtuous, if dry, Reverend Boyer through smiles, rational conversation, and promises of friendship, while appearing to Peter Sanford as "the very soul of pleasure." For the fun-loving rake, "the highest entertainment receives its greatest charm from her smiles."[25] Eliza's capacity for performance would perhaps, in other circumstances, render her an excellent "female manager for the theater," a vocation in which, as she suggests to a friend, she would put forth productions "under much better regulations than at present" (124).

In reality, everyone in Eliza's world is a careful actor. She notes that even the seemingly transparent Reverend Boyer works hard to act the part of the successful suitor: "I soon perceived that every word, every action, and every look was studied to gain my approbation. As he sat next me at dinner, his assiduity and politeness were pleasing; and as we walked together afterwards, his conversation was improving. Mine was sentimental and sedate; perfectly adapted to the taste of my gallant" (12). As Jeffrey Richards argues,

in Eliza's world, "there is no space in which one can *be* without subjection to exacting standards of what constitutes acceptable performance."[26]

Critics such as Gillian Brown and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg have pointed out that Eliza's physical decline actually begins after Boyer's rebuff, suggesting that Eliza's failing body marks her exit from the performative sphere of courtship and coquetry.[27] Yet while Eliza is deeply affected by the loss of Boyer's attentions, the novel provides ample evidence that she has not yet relinquished her claim to performance. Once her interest is piqued by Sanford's return, she deftly manipulates the impressions wrought by her changed physical state to disguise her intentions. Writing to Lucy Sumner, Eliza excuses herself from a trip to Boston, a trip that would have removed her from Sanford's presence, by alluding to the depression she had physically manifested over the past several months. She would find it "painful," she writes, to mix again in company and suggests that the "melancholy reflections" oppressing her were more likely to be dissipated at home than abroad (125). Eliza is able to exercise her own choice by performing a role based on the perceptions others would have of her symptomatic body. Indeed, after arranging to remain near Sanford, Eliza remains deft enough at subterfuge to carry out an affair with him in her mother's own house for some time.

Critics have been more likely to read Charlotte Temple as a wholly transparent character. Although she is less practiced than Foster's Eliza, Charlotte also produces canny narratives to account for any bodily signs of deception. Facing the school's headmistress after a sleepless night contemplating her imminent elopement with Montraville, Charlotte is not able to maintain her normal composure, but quickly accounts for the pangs of conscience legible in her physiognomy. When Madame Du Pont asks about the "languor so apparent in [her] frame," Charlotte dismisses the inquiry with a smile.[28] In doing so, Charlotte creates a distance between her face and her feelings — a somatic rupture that allows her to make a decision at odds with her guardians' wishes, and it would seem, her own instincts.

Such skill at masking the signals the body sends could well have been read by an eighteenth-century audience as a product of the girls' Enlightenment upbringing. Both girls are portrayed as models of Lockean childrearing in which affectionate parents model correct behavior, rather than coerce it through physical punishment. Notably, both Eliza (whose father is dead) and Charlotte (whose father is a model of paternal indulgence) are free from the coercive paternal force that generated much of the conflict in *Clarissa*.

Instead, both Charlotte and Eliza are the product of what Richard Brodhead has deemed the Lockean system of "disciplinary intimacy."[29] Rather than forcing a child to do one's bidding, Lockean-inspired parents must rule by example and by moral suasion. Yet as I discuss in chapter 2, while Locke argued against corporeal punishment, the body was still a vital instrument in his disciplinary toolbox. For Locke, experience gained through the senses provided the source of both knowledge and morality. Because sensual experience was so incredibly powerful, learning how to modulate one's own response to the body's experience, and the promptings that sprang from such experience, was vital to moral development.[30] The logic behind Locke's much-discussed disciplinary shift away from physical punishment, I contend, came less from a repugnance to the cruelty of beating, than from an investment in a stoic ability to modulate one's own reactions to pleasure and pain. For Locke, beating "contributes not at all to the mastery of our natural propensity to indulge corporal and present pleasure, and to avoid pain at any rate, but rather encourages it; and so strengthens that in us, which is the root of all vicious and wrong actions."[31] Instead of being led by physical demands, one needed to cultivate a mastery over the body which would result in the ability to modulate, and if necessary, ignore, the promptings of both pleasure and pain.

In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke insists that the ability to mediate consciousness amid sensual experience (both pleasant and unpleasant) is what makes us individual human beings. "[I]f we take wholly away all consciousness of our actions and sensations," Locke writes, "especially of pleasure and pain, and the concernment that accompanies it, it will be hard to know wherein to place personal identity."[32] Because the "concernment" that accompanies pleasure and pain is central to identity, the ability to carefully distinguish one's consciousness from the pleasure and pain that impinged on it allowed for, indeed demanded, the cultivation of a carefully performed identity. In other words, Locke's "concernment," if properly developed, should result in behavior and actions that were rationally detached from the body's inner promptings or from outer signals. Certainly, Locke did not set out to create careful performers — he wished to create "natural" men with unaffected manners. Yet his insistence that one's personality was something that was inscribed — first by parents, and then by the child who has come of age — posits a necessary distance between the writer and what is written. Rather than manifesting the inherent characteristics of an

aristocratic bloodline, or literalizing divine will, Locke's model of human development places the individual's mind as the ultimate commander of the (admittedly influential) body. The individual emerges as the prime creator of his or her "personal identity" and as such, that individual could change that identity, or disguise it, as he or she might like. These novels herald the dangers of such a model.

Before their pregnancies, the heroines of *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple* are able to exist within this dangerous realm of performance where a discerning mind overrules an emoting body. Before their fall, Eliza and Charlotte illustrate a portrait of female subjectivity drawn by Jean Jacques Rousseau. For women, Rousseau points out, the need to modulate their desires and impulses is more pronounced than for men. Woman, after all, "is made to please and to be subjected." Thus, for Rousseau, she must constantly be aware of the effect she has on others: "she ought to make herself pleasing to man instead of provoking him. Her strength is in her charms; by their means she should compel him to discover his strength and to use it."[33] The skills of a coquette represent the culmination of such a philosophy.

The early lessons in self-control the girls would have received as children facilitate their later ability to slip away from the watchful eyes of female guardians and parents. The Lockean imperative to keep physical sensation at a distance in order to maintain dominion over the body has taught these women not how to deny their desires, but rather how to disguise the messages the body attempts to transmit. When a child has learned to bear discomfort without flinching, and to defer pleasure without visibly pining for it, these novels suggest, she will inevitably become an illegible text that allows no one to discern interior states from exterior signs. In other words, she will have moved from the helpless transparency of childhood to the performative world of adults who control their own bodies and the perceptions others have of those bodies.

When Charlotte smiles to disguise her sinking heart, and Eliza adapts her demeanor to suit her companion, they emblematize Rousseau's portrait of woman as a canny manager of her own often unruly body. As Gillian Brown has argued, Rousseau suggests that *all* women are at pains to distance their exterior performances of modesty from their insatiably desiring bodies.[34] "Why do you consult their words when it is not their mouth which ought to speak?" Rousseau inquires. Instead, a wise observer should discern the truth by observing women's "eyes, their color, their breathing,

their timid manner, and above all, their slight resistance."[35] What a woman says, therefore, is almost always at odds with the signals her body sends.

However, as these novels move towards denouement, they complicate, and ultimately refute, Rousseau's notion that women's bodies are a source of temptation that demands control. As the heroines move closer to their fall, it is their own bodies that clamor in protest. And once a woman has "fallen" in these texts, it is the pregnant body that leads her to redemption. Rather than Rousseau's desirous female body requiring the deception of performance, the bodies of these women actually function as the repository of virtue, in conflict with the verbal and physical performances the women enact. Their bodies do not lead them astray; rather, it is their bodies that act as indices of their own uncomfortable consciences. The sleepless night that manifests in Charlotte's visible languor has not been produced by her desire for Montraville, but by her inherently virtuous recoiling from the planned elopement. As Marion Rust has argued, "it is in relaxing her sensitivity to her own impulses, not in giving in to them, that Charlotte loses her virginity and then her life."[36] When Eliza Wharton is surprised by finding the dry Reverend Boyer in the parlor instead of the charming rake Sanford, she is perplexed by her own physical reaction: "I blushed and stammered; but I know not why; for certain I am, that I neither love nor fear the good man yet, whatever I may do some future day" (19). As her striking depression and decline at his rebuff might suggest, Eliza did indeed feel either love for or fear of Boyer — but she was unable or unwilling to properly interpret the bodily signals that told her so.

The portrait of the white female body depicted by these two texts does not endorse an insistence on a disjunction between one's face and one's feelings, but neither does it truly enact the sentimental ethos with which these novels are often attributed. Clearly, if characters worked within a fully sentimental framework, wherein, as Karen Sánchez-Eppler suggests, "the self is externally displayed, and the body provides a reliable sign of who one is," the rakes would never have gotten past the initial meeting.[37] Rather, these texts depict a transition from a modulated detachment from the body (a detachment aligned with adult rationality) to a sentimental investment in the body's transparency. Pregnancy operates as the mechanism that articulates the heroines' transformation from deceptive and unreadable women who use their bodies as instruments of their will into virtual infants whose desires and intentions are clearly manifest on their bodies.

As the debate over epigenesis reveals, Charlotte's and Eliza's pregnancies occur at a moment when fundamental beliefs about the role of the divine in human development — and, in particular, the patriarchal order endorsed by divinity — were in flux. In the midst of the potentially empowering prospect of a woman's dominion over her own offspring, these novels reinstate the woman's body as the vessel of divine force. The depiction of their heroines' pregnancies works through the age-old notion of maternal impression to create a portrait of development in which the body is reinstated as a passive receptacle acted on by forces out of its control. The theory of maternal impression, which harks back to ancient times, took on a particular resonance in light of the gradual acceptance of epigenetic theory. According to this belief, the mother's emotional experiences manifest as a physical imprint on the fetus's body. *Aristotle's Compleat Masterpiece*, a popular childrearing treatise republished throughout the eighteenth century, expounds on the porous boundary between a mother's mind and a fetus's physical composition: "[T]he imaginative Power, at the time of conception . . . is of such force, that it stamps a character of the thing imagin'd upon the Child: so that the Children of an Adulteress, by the Mother's Imaginative Power, may have the nearest Resemblance to her own Husband, tho' begotten by another Man. And through this Power of the Imaginative Faculty it was, that a Woman at the time of conception, beholding the Picture of a Blackamoor conceiv'd, and brought forth a Child resembling an Ethiopian."[38] Maternal impression, as described here, is a decidedly double-edged sword. On one hand, such a model invests women with an incredible amount of power. The savvy adulteress can literally alter the fetal body — a body that should provide evidence of her deception — through the force of her thought. The second woman, however, allows her interior to be invaded by outside stimuli, and dooms herself in the process. By her unguardedly "beholding" the portrait of another man at the moment of conception, she allows the portrait's impression to shape the material within her. A similar anxiety surrounding the moment of conception infuses the plot of Laurence Sterne's midcentury novel *Tristram Shandy*, which details the woes of a man who, because of infelicitous circumstances at the moment of conception, was supposedly doomed to a life of misfortune.

The *in utero* transubstantiation from the imaginative to the material does not happen only at the moment of conception, however. The *Compleat Masterpiece* relates several cases where a strong impression made on a preg-

nant woman literally leaves an indelible mark on her offspring. When a "worthy Gentlewoman" passes by a butcher and finds her face splattered with blood, she knows immediately "[t]hat her Child would have some Blemish on his face: Which proved true; for at the Birth it was found marked with a red Spot."[39] In one respect, maternal impression provides proof of the mind's power over the body, or to be specific, the power of the mother's adult mind over the fetal body. For according to this theory, the fetus — and eventual child — materializes the immaterial thoughts and feelings of the mother. Franny Nudelman reads Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* through the lens of maternal impression to suggest that the unruly passion of little Pearl serves as an expression of the ardent mystery of her mother. The child, for Nudelman, acts as a far better agent of discipline than the scarlet letter, whose symbolic indeterminacy has long been celebrated by literary critics. Pearl, unlike the letter, "perfectly reveals her source" — she represents the precise embodiment of Hester's interior state, the literal manifestation of her mother's otherwise unreadable passion and anguish.[40]

The metamorphoses that occur within Charlotte's and Eliza's body ultimately reverse the centuries-old doctrine of maternal impression. In *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple*, the unborn fetus enacts an even more compact symbolic economy than what Nudelman describes: rather than acting as a separate entity that reflects the mother's heretofore hidden sinful passions, it acts as a mysterious force within the mother's own body, first to reveal, and then to transform, her shadowy interior. The concept of an unborn child purging its mother of sin, and ultimately redeeming her from it, also diverges sharply from the model emblematized by the long-standing tradition of "churching." This ritual, an act of thanksgiving for the mother's survival, also symbolically purified the woman after carrying the unborn child — a vessel for original sin.

In many ways, the form of potential motherhood foregrounded in these texts is an explicit rebuff of what Linda Kerber has famously deemed "republican motherhood." Republican motherhood, Kerber suggests, was grounded in stoic principles of sacrifice, and of emotional detachment from one's offspring. The republican mother "made use of the classic formulation of the Spartan mother who raised sons to sacrifice themselves to the good of the *polis*."[41] In *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple* however, motherhood is the antithesis of stoic power. Instead, the act of childbearing renders stoic

detachment impossible, as the growing fetus gradually destroys the woman's ability to modulate her own body, and the offspring of that body. Charlotte refers repeatedly to the developing fetus within her as "innocent," but her pregnancy emerges as a physical manifestation of Charlotte's own guilt. These novels do not merely indicate that pregnancy inevitably renders a woman's interior public — they suggest that the reproductive process actually *alters* that interior itself. And like a guilty conscience, the fetus works from within to dispel all subterfuge and to bring the sinner's soul to proper repentance. For Charlotte, the fetus seems to raze the mother from the inside out, causing "the anguish of her heart" to "strike at the strings of life" (86). Her health steadily declines as her pregnancy seems to create a direct correlation between interior and exterior states. She is no longer able to conceal the promptings of her body with a hasty story and a smile. "Real anguish of heart," the narrator tells us, "had in a great measure faded her charms, her cheeks were pale from want of rest, and her eyes, by frequent, indeed almost continued weeping, were sunk and heavy" (103). As her body becomes weakened, so does her ability to maintain any shred of artifice. The disjunction between inside and outside becomes almost perfectly realigned. Put simply, the body first discloses the woman's sin, and then, by inciting remorse, redeems her from it. This process is made possible only through the increasingly visible presence of pregnancy, a presence that renders Charlotte, through her physical weakness and vulnerability, increasingly childlike.[42]

Eliza Wharton goes through a similar transformation, perhaps all the more remarkable in light of her previous skill at keeping her intentions from becoming physically legible. In a letter to her mother, written because "the effect of [her] crime has become too obvious to be longer concealed," Eliza alludes to "the severest pains, both of body and mind" (231). For once, Eliza is not managing her own performance. The pregnancy has rendered her previously deceptive exterior transparent. The sickness of her body perfectly reflects the pangs of remorse that torture her. Self-diagnosed with "a confirmed consumption," Eliza dies, along with her infant, after her "conscience is awakened to a conviction of her guilt" (231). Eliza and Charlotte, after having enjoyed brief sojourns as consenting agents, capable of keeping their intentions private and unseen, are eventually rendered ciphers — their thoughts, their feelings, and ultimately their bodies, subsumed by the growing power of the fetus.

The New Birth and Wayward Daughters

We cannot fully understand how these women's bodies function as both their chastisement *and* their redemption without engaging the regional voices of the Great Awakening that propounded an alternate vision of the body to those offered by liberal notions of adult self-ownership, or classical republican celebrations of physical self-control. For many of the ministers of the First Great Awakening, one had to allow the body to remain porous in order to be receptive to the touch of God. New Light Calvinists like George Whitefield expanded on the Puritan insistence that conversion experience was almost always marked by deep suffering, and often rendered such suffering in explicitly corporeal terms. As Susan Juster points out, metaphors used to describe the workings of revivalist grace depicted powerful, often painful physical experiences. Believers are subject to "pulsations," "eruptions," "waves," and "fires" that "ignite" and "engulf" them.[43] The experience of deeply felt physical pain and revulsion was in itself an indication that a new spiritual birth was at hand. In a 1728 sermon, Israel Loring insists "[t]here is no bringing a natural man to Christ, til he apprehends himself poor, wretched, blind, naked and miserable, and that he stands in absolute need of him."[44] If an audience member wanted to be saved, George Whitefield would have him ask God to "awaken me tho' it be with Thunder, to a sensible feeling of the Corruption of my fallen Nature." In order to be in the proper state to receive grace, a seeker would have to feel experientially, "I am conceived and born in Sin, my whole Head is sick my whole Heart is faint, from the Crown of my Head to the Sole of my Feet, I am full of Wounds and Bruises and putrifying Sores. And yet I see it not."[45] Whitefield was purported to suffer from recurrent vomiting before and after sermons, a process that caused him to physically waste away as part of the kenotic process.[46]

Whitefield's physical ailments notwithstanding, conservative ministers — sharing the era's ambivalent stance towards theatricality — were wary that "the marks of the new birth" could be faked by canny performers. The fact that Whitefield became an object of burlesque parody on the eighteenth-century stage testifies both to how recognizable he had become and how broadly theatrical his sermons were.[47] Even Whitefield himself, in the passage above, admits that he cannot "see" the wounded and weakened body that he *feels* so acutely. Although a spiritual transformation could well produce a legible change in the person's physical appearance and behav-

ior, all bodily displays did not necessarily denote a state of grace or virtue within. How to tell the difference between performed spirituality and authentic states of grace was, of course, the great and unsolvable question.

One possible answer to the dilemma can be found by returning to the Indian captivity narrative, and its emphasis on the redemptive power of affliction. In the concluding passage of Mary Rowlandson's 1682 captivity narrative, the narrator seeks, and seems to find, reliable evidence of God's personal intervention through her experience of physical suffering:

> Before I knew what affliction meant, I was ready sometimes to wish for it. When I lived in prosperity; having the comforts of the World about me, my Relations by me, and my heart cheerful: and taking little care for anything and yet seeing many (whom I preferred before my self) under many trials and afflictions, in sickness, weakness, poverty, losses, crosses, and cares of the World, I should be sometimes jealous least I have my portion in this life; and that Scripture would come to my mind, *Heb*. 12.6 *For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every Son whom he receiveth*.[48] (emphasis Rowlandson's)

The affliction Rowlandson envies here is, first and foremost, the affliction she can "see" in others. As Elaine Scarry argues, much of the Old Testament — which, after all, is dedicated to illustrating God's invisible presence — depends on the wounded and altered body as proof of divine intervention.[49] Job's many afflictions, and the boils bestowed as part of the ten plagues, are just two examples of the Old Testament God making his presence felt through wounding the body. Within this framework, affliction functions as evidence that God is still interested enough in his handiwork to manifest his presence materially.[50]

Pregnancy is perhaps the most popular biblical model for God's intervention on the body. From Abraham's wife Sarah, who conceives long after she should have been biologically capable, to Mary's miraculously virginal conception, one could trace God's creative force through the generative power of reproduction. As Laura Henigman and others have pointed out, maternity was one of the most powerful metaphors for early New Englanders seeking to describe God's relationship to humankind, a trend that intensified as Christianity moved towards images of God as a benevolent parent, rather than a punitive ruler.[51] Further, the pain of childbirth was of great significance in Protestant dogma. The anguish of labor, after all, was God's punishment

for Eve trying to hide her desires and actions. As Jennifer Morgan points out, labor pains were so extensively connected to the divine that the ability to give birth without pain had been considered evidence of witchcraft.[52] One writer, discussing the apparently painless births of African women, writes that Africans "seem exempted from the curse inflicted upon Eve and *her daughters*."[53] The fateful pregnancies of both Eliza and Charlotte — and the arduous births that neither woman was able to survive — placed them in an explicitly racialized discourse that defined women's reproductive misery as evidence of a sacred heritage and as a mark of civilization.

As white Christian "daughters of Eve," Charlotte and Eliza share in the Great Awakening's emphasis on the new birth, which tapped into the metaphorical power of pregnancy to denote miraculous regeneration. Thus the emerging religious rhetoric of the new birth had implications, not just for how one might understand the role of suffering in spiritual transformation (the metaphorical new birth), but also for how to understand the material process of actual birth — and the processes of conception and pregnancy that preceded it. Jonathan Edwards, a man who had spent a good deal of time thinking about the points of overlap between spiritual and physical transformation, used the concept of the spiritual new birth to appropriate the evolving — and threatening — emergence of an epigenetic fetus.[54] Edwards, struggling with the loss of scientific proof of a great chain of being, fashioned the evolving development of a fetus as an analogy for the process of creating a "new creature," or convert, wrought by Christ. Notably, the heart features largely in both terms of the analogy: "In the conception of an animal and the formation of the embryo, the first thing that appears is the *punctum saliens*, or the heart, which beats as soon as it exists. This is a lively image of the manner of the formation of the new creature. The first thing is a new heart, a new sense and inclination that is a principle of new life; a principal, that however small, has vigor and power."[55] The heart here does double duty as metaphor and as biological material. By aligning spiritual language with scientific observation, Edwards translates the empirical facts of the fetal development into proof of the power of feeling and the role of grace. Edward's fetal heart welds powerful emotion, salvific grace, and physical change together in one single image.

For the generation of male doctors and midwives who were seeking to assert their authority over the realm of pregnancy, the heart also plays a central role in the transformative, and often destructive, properties of preg-

nancy. When eighteenth-century doctors were confronted with puerperal fever — a syndrome that killed many women in childbirth, and that contemporary readers would likely hold responsible for the deaths of Charlotte and Eliza — many explained the illness in terms resonant with Edwards's terminology. In the medical documents, however, it is the pregnant *mother*'s heart that undergoes drastic change, rather than the "new creature's." John Leake's 1772 treatise, for example, argued that pregnancy itself rendered the body "tender" and "irritable" in ways that led naturally to the racing heartbeat and general "excitability" that led to puerperal fever.[56] In other words, the fetus transformed and weakened the mother's body, leaving her more susceptible to this deadly illness. In Charlotte's and Eliza's case, biology and spirituality are fused through their transformative pregnancies. For them, the evangelical framing of pregnancy as creating "a new heart" becomes an unbearable biological burden on the old one.

In another move that aligns spiritual suffering with the pain-laden process of childbirth, Jonathan Edwards updates Eve's curse to realign human birth with the redemptive process of the new birth. In entry 18 of *Images*, Edwards explicitly connects the pain of labor to the pain of spiritual generation: "Women travail and suffer great pains in bringing children [forth], which is to represent the great persecutions and sufferings of the church in bringing forth Christ and [a] type of those spiritual pains that are in the soul when bringing forth Christ."[57] Foster's and Rowson's novels similarly conflate the fetus with redemptive affliction: pregnancy is inseparable from the physical suffering that leads to the women's pious deaths.

Significantly, both women, like the suffering heroines in Puritan captivity narratives, and like Whitefield himself, are brought to salvation through their physical pains, pain often rendered in terms resonant with readers familiar with conversion experiences. As Marion Rust points out, shortly before her death, "Charlotte descends into a 'phrenzy' that owes much to the evangelical tradition."[58] Julia Stern argues that Foster creates a heroine who is "at home in the world of emotion, familiar with the sort of fervor that marks the Great Awakening — the repercussions of which are felt in the Connecticut River Valley for decades after its initial eruption."[59]

At least for George Whitefield, resistance to conversion, followed by the physical pain of descending grace, was testimony of God's direct intervention upon a sinner. Suffering bodies are manifestations of the hand of God, and demonstrate the folly of belief in self-ownership. As pregnancy pro-

gresses, regardless of a woman's feelings about it, so does conversion work against one's "free will":

> Indeed, our deists tell us, that man now has a free will to do good, to love God, and to repent when he will; but indeed, there is no free will in any of you, but to sin; nay, your free-will leads you so far, that you would, if possible, pull God from His throne. This may, perhaps, offend the Pharisees; but (it is the truth in Christ which I speak, I lie not) every man by his own natural will hate God; but when he is turned unto the Lord, by evangelical repentance, then his will is changed; then your consciences, nor hardened and benumbed, shall be quickened and awakened; then your hard hearts shall be melted, and your unruly affections shall be crucified.[60]

The Coquette, as several critics have argued, is more critical of religion than *Charlotte Temple* appears to be, yet the willful Eliza seems to have been brought to complete spiritual transformation by her pregnancy, dismantling the strong will that had bedeviled her friends and relatives for most of the narrative. As she nears the end of her pregnancy, her language echoes scripture and the Great Awakening preachers who quoted it. Leaving her mother's house, her words are those of Christ on the cross, as she momentously declares "it is finished" (148). In her last exchange with Sanford, Eliza's part of the dialogue could be excerpted from a Whitefield sermon. Whitefield exhorts readers to ask God to "awaken me tho' it be with Thunder, to a sensible feeling of the Corruption of my fallen Nature." Similarly, Eliza is "awakened to a conviction of [her] guilt" by the painful physical experience of pregnancy.

After exhorting the rakish Sanford to "add not to the number of those deluded creatures, who will one day rise up in judgment against you, and condemn you," Eliza then softens her manner, and seeks to bring Sanford to an awakening akin to what she has experienced (159). "If I am severe," said she, "it is because I wish to impress your mind with such a sense of your offences against your Maker, your friends, and society in general, as may effect your repentance and amendment. I wish not to be your accuser, but your reformer. On several accounts, I view my own crime in a more aggravated light than yours; but my conscience is awakened to a conviction of my guilt. Yours, I fear, is not. Let me conjure you to return home, and endeavor, by your future kindness and fidelity to your wife, to make her all the amends in your power" (160).

Once disdainful of Reverend Boyer's sanctimonious attempts to control her, Eliza has been remade to the extent that her rhetoric exceeds Boyer's in religiosity. Eliza dies among strangers, but by all reports, her transformative pregnancy has led her to the point where she can confidently expect a final reward. Her friends take much comfort from what they hear of "the state of her mind, in her last hours" (168).

Charlotte reads her own painful pregnancy as the process through which she has bought her own salvation. As she nears death, Charlotte seems surer of herself than at any other point of the novel. "I have an humble confidence," she tells Mrs. Beauchamp, "in the mercy of him who died to save the world, and trust that my sufferings in this state of mortality, joined to my unfeigned repentance, through his mercy, have blotted my offences from the sight of my offended maker" (114). And the novel gives us no reason to think Charlotte's confidence ill-placed. She dies in her father's arms, with a countenance at first "serenely composed" and then illuminated at the moment of passing by a "beam of joy" (114).

If we read these episodes within the framework provided by Great Awakening preaching (as, arguably, many readers did), then these women's deaths are redemptive, rather than tragic. According to this perspective, the worldly, canny female actors who believed they could control the dispensation of their bodies are transformed by the workings of those very bodies into spectacles of sin acknowledged and, ultimately, forgiven. Yet unlike Whitefield, the quintessential convert of the mid- to late eighteenth century, Charlotte and Eliza have no possibility for the personal empowerment and self-aggrandizement that such fusion with the divine seemed to offer. Susan Juster has argued that for early American women, the job of conversion was to gain a sense of autonomy. For Charlotte and Eliza, however, the result of conversion is not independence, but erasure. While Whitefield was able to emerge from his painful (and seemingly perpetual) conversion experience to lay claim to a personal power he scandalously aligned with Christ's own magnetism, for the women in these novels self-surrender can mean only self-immolation.

To return to Paine's image of America's fair origin once more, I suggest that pregnancy does not actually solve the problem of competing identities that his self-parenting child presents. Rather than providing a figure that can possess both the well-regulated conduct of a republican mother and the absolute innocence of the newly born (or to be more precise, the

soon-to-be born) nation, the disastrous pregnancies of *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette* reiterate the conflict so drastically that each possible identity obliterates the other. For Charlotte and Eliza, the mother's new heart and the "new creature" she is supposedly creating collapse in on one another. Nancy Ruttenberg has suggested that the "epochal personality" of the early republic can be characterized as the convert, "the one wholly engaged in that process of self-translation by which the 'new creature' emerges from the old and, in so doing, claims access to a transcendent meaning."[61] By rendering pregnancy an act of unwilling conversion, these novels offer a rich set of possible perspectives from which to anticipate and interpret the "new creature" emerging out of a disobedient colonial child's quest for agency. As Julia Stern has argued, "the reproduction of mothering" is the "great unspoken subject of both *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette*."[62] I suggest that the collapse of pregnancy with conversion in these texts enacts a dynamic through which the mother (-to-be), much like Paine's convoluted America of fair origin, experiences a sort of second birth.

Merging the process of becoming a potential mother with the process of conversion allows these texts to appropriate national maternal grief (for Mother England, among others) and cathect it with the possibility of fusion with the divine. Yes, the child destroys the mother, but, in these novels, doing so is necessary and righteous. In a republic plagued by filial guilt and grief for a defeated Mother country, the story of a new creature whose matricidal origins were both honorable and salvific would have been particularly powerful. By applying Great Awakening theology to the process of pregnancy, these texts craft a particularly dense portrait of a woman's emotional and spiritual transformation through reproduction. In distinction from the portrayal of poor and black women as unfeeling reproductive machines, these texts craft white motherhood as an all-encompassing experience that corrects a woman's faults, and negates the claims to consent that were emerging in other areas. Pregnancy for white women becomes an act of infantilizing discipline, rendering her a passive vessel to a process that undoes her claims to the adult world of consent and autonomy.

The two different fates Rowson and Foster assign the ghostly child-to-be in their texts illustrate how infantilizing depictions of women also shaped the meanings one might assign to the infants such women produced. *The Coquette*, in this respect, stays true to the facts of the Elizabeth Whitman case that inspired the novel.[63] Eliza's child, like Elizabeth's, dies along with

the mother. Rowson, however, offers us a sequel in which we see the offspring of the wayward mother grow to adulthood. That adulthood ultimately enacts the same function of her fetal life — exposing, correcting, and ultimately killing a deceitful parent. Because Lucy Temple does not know her true father's identity, she is unaware of the incestuous nature of her own desire. She falls in love with her half-brother, the offspring of her father Montraville and his wife, Julia Franklin. This son, engaged to Lucy, proudly shows his father a picture of his fiancée, who of course bears a striking resemblance to her mother. Montraville, already weakened by a lifetime of guilt, is unable to bear the shock of seeing the spitting image of the woman he seduced. Upon viewing the image, he goes into paroxysms and dies. Lucy, for her part, decides to forgo reproduction altogether, setting herself up for a life of chastity. In both the case of Eliza's unnamed infant and the case of Charlotte's daughter Lucy, the child's association with suffering is clear — but the primary suffering is visited on sinful parents. The children of rebellious parents, these novels suggest, are destined to punish them for their sins. Against this backdrop, it seems significant that the two daughters of sinful mothers are both kept from ever becoming mothers themselves. And perhaps here emerges a glimpse of the protofeminist consciousness that so many critics have wanted to find in these novels. Certainly, the texts warn against premarital sex. The primary horror, however, is pregnancy itself — it is pregnancy that shames and ultimately kills these women. Thus, I suggest, these texts are indeed warning women, but not in the way they professed. Being a coquette only becomes a death sentence when one becomes a mother.

As Cathy Davidson's analysis reminds us, the unwanted pregnancies and deaths in childbirth that figure so prominently in *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette* were not simply potent metaphors, they were fearful physical realities for women in the postrevolutionary era. In the midst of the very real biological threat of childbirth that early national women faced, and the matrix of male-authored texts in which pregnancy was theorized, these novels' attention to pregnancy provides an extended — and largely unprecedented — female meditation on how pregnancy sabotages a woman's attempt to fully control her body, regardless of whether one believes that controlling the body is a worthy goal. Considering demographic data showing sharply declining fertility rates in the generations following the publication of *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple*, we may not be too presumptuous

to think that, for the many female readers of these texts, the transcendence these pregnancies appeared to offer was not a sufficient reward for the complete dismantling of agency and individuality that they also seemed to herald.[64] The ghostly child-to-be in these texts undoubtedly infantilizes the heroines, but it also highlights the social, political, and physical dangers that attend that infantile position.

Finally, acknowledging the physical threats of pregnancy opens up a third alternative to the untenable choice between secular self-possession and spiritual self-emptying that I have been sketching here — and that ultimately collapses by the novels' ending pages. By focusing on the body's limits, *Charlotte Temple* and *The Coquette* question the limit of two competing models of authority over that body, and by extension, two competing models of adulthood. Because they explore the national body through the uniquely female experience of pregnancy, these novels problematize *both* the religious and the secular views of the body as an individualized entity that could be either managed as property or emptied as a divine vessel. Pregnancy disrupts the fantasy of self-ownership so coveted by Enlightenment theorists, but it also troubles the notion of handing over one's body to spiritual forces that deprive one of individual will. Like Paine's blurred mother-infant nation, the maternal body in these texts cannot easily draw the line between self and other, between invisible desire and visible performance, or between the denial of adult agency and the rebellion that such denial will inevitably provoke.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Revolutionary Child

Slavery, Affective Contracts, and the Future Perfect

THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER discussed how pregnancy functioned as a potent site for exploring the possibility of white women's consent in two popular late eighteenth-century seduction novels. Ultimately, the fatal pregnancies of protagonists Charlotte and Eliza infantilized the women themselves, rendering them utterly at the mercy of bodies they could not control. Infantilizing narratives also helped to articulate the nightmarish loss of control that accompanied slavery. Indeed, in the late eighteenth century, seduction and slavery were linked rhetorically in both political and literary discourse. The first American seduction novel opens with the libertine Harrington calling to "the gentle God of Love" whose formidable powers "rivetest the chains of thy slaves."[1] In the case of both, the slave and the victim (or, in Harrington's case, the perpetrator) of seduction cannot fully control their own actions; their bodies are held captive by forces beyond their control.[2] As the nineteenth century progressed, however, the rhetorical connection between slavery and seduction — a comparison that made allowances for the will, albeit the often unruly will, of the victim — was supplanted by a vision of the childlike slave. In this later version, the alleged childishness of the slave evoked not unruly and untamed desire, but rather complete dependence and elaborate vulnerability that would forever demand the care of paternalistic whites. As writers on both sides of the slavery debate linked the slave with a childlike victim, the revolutionary potential Locke saw in childhood had to compete with a vision of the child as extravagantly vulnerable — as a

victim needing constant protection — rather than a potential adult in need of encouragement.

Undoubtedly, infantilizing depictions of the black subject have worked to deny black people the privileges of adulthood and citizenship. Scholars and activists who have worked to untangle the metaphorical skeins linking the black subject to the helpless child have done critically important work. This chapter moves beyond charting the damage infantilization has done to parse the mechanics of how the metaphor worked by paying respectful attention to the historical experiences of enslaved children themselves. I hope to foreground the experience, and the words, of enslaved people to return to the child/slave analogy in a way that doesn't force either the slave or the child into an illusory position either of unresisting victimhood or of unmediated authenticity and autonomy. Instead, I look to black writers to reinstate their own conception of personhood as a flexible, engaged, mutable subject, whose power lies not in some mythic adult detachment from the social and political environment, but rather in the ability to incorporate their own interdependence and vulnerability into a position of supple adaptability and resilience. Rather than categorizing the literary relationship between blacks and whites as one of power and subordination, I want to rethink it in terms of largely unacknowledged debt. In sum, instead of simply describing how white writers infantilized blacks, this chapter seeks to chart how the terms of infantilization themselves became toxic.

The equivalence of child and slave that gained considerable cultural purchase throughout the nineteenth century actually represented a startling departure from Enlightenment representations of childhood that defined the child in terms of an inalienable (if yet unrealized) right to freedom and independence — a definition that was central to revolutionary ideology.[3] Even as the popular American seduction novels of the era infantilized their protagonists, they did so within a framework that engaged the questions of consent and control that dominated revolutionary rhetoric. Writers wrestling with the paradox of slavery in the years between the Revolution and the Civil War would ultimately alter that framework, realigning the child's primary metaphorical valence from the embodiment of unfairly repressed potential to the epitome of a perpetual victim. Children, who were co-opted to represent slaves by writers on both sides of the slavery debate, were transformed from young people destined to grow up and assume the

mantle of reasoned consent to orphans in need of endless care — victims in the making.

In the late eighteenth century, revolutionary pamphleteers, rhetoricians, and philosophers made their case by building on Locke's insistence that children were not subjects for life, but merely future citizens who deserved careful nurturance. Writers increasingly aligned the rebels' cause with the figure of a child denied the fundamental right of creating a future of his or her choice.[4] Jay Fliegelman, Gillian Brown, Caroline Levander, and others have demonstrated that the child provided a vital conceptual framework through which colonists could reimagine their filial and affective ties with a mother country who refused to respect and enable the development of natural rights. I use gender-inclusive terminology here advisedly, for although the beneficiaries of revolutionary rhetoric were primarily white men of property, the child figure through which that constituency imagined its national origins was a remarkably malleable figure. As I discuss in my earlier chapter, Richardson's Clarissa, Rowson's Charlotte Temple, and Foster's Eliza Wharton are some of the more famous examples of the rebellious daughter whose yearning for agency articulated some of the pre- and postrevolutionary era's questions about filial obedience and individual liberty. Not surprisingly, these revolutionary children were often perched at the edge of adulthood, emblematizing the move from dependence into the self-government that was increasingly formulated as a natural right. As white Americans eagerly read Clarissa's story of rebellion against a tyrannical father, as the Sons of Liberty misbehaved, as Thomas Paine described England as a monstrous mother who would devour her very children, the figure of the unjustly stifled child became a clarion call for freedom.[5] As scholars Michael Wallace and Edwin Burrows have suggested, the narrative of shifting family dynamics was the "lingua franca of the Revolution."[6]

Priscilla Wald, writing in a twentieth-century context, has argued that the modern child represents "our fundamental faith in reproducing futurity, that in turn rests on a sort of biological determinism, the idea that characters and destinies are inscribed in our bodies."[7] Such faith in a predictable future bound by bloodline, Wald contends, could be expressed in the future perfect. Our knowledge of a child's hereditary programming would allow us to know in advance what he *will have done*, before he ever actually does it. Caroline Levander's work on the American Revolution has ably shown that much revolutionary rhetoric did seek to create a sense of racial determinism,

as authors argued that children with Anglo-Saxon blood would inevitably embody the ideals of freedom intrinsic to that inheritance. As Levander points out, the 1775 Congress argued that Americans derived their love of liberty from their English forefathers as they argued that their Anglo-Saxon "ancestry . . . from which we derive our descent" allowed them to make claims for liberty.[8]

Against this investment in the child as the container of a predictable future, Lockean — and eventually, American — revolutionary discourse changes the basis of power from bloodline to age. As Holly Brewer's work demonstrates, however, Locke's attention to a child as a site of great potentiality was a double-edged sword. Although Enlightenment visions of childhood invested in the child's latent possibilities, they also deprived children who had not yet reached the age of reason of what little power they might have had under the rule of birthright. In order to create the consenting adult citizen, the nonconsenting child took on negative political weight. As Brewer writes, "in American society after the Revolution, to the extent that the Revolutionaries consciously adopted what they would call republican or whig political ideas, children became the group most clearly excluded from both political and personal power."[9]

Yet even within the restrictions Lockean philosophy placed on those who had yet to cross the boundary into meaningful consent, the child that emerged from his philosophy radically disrupted the logic of biological determinism that had dominated political thought for centuries. The primary job of the revolutionary child, after all, is to prove definitively *different* from his or her parents. Richardson's Clarissa deviates sharply from her father's and siblings' greed. Her defiance of her father's wishes creates a stark contrast to her mother's depressed acquiescence. Benjamin Franklin, perhaps the most striking nonfictional revolutionary child, emerges as a wholly self-made man, who took few personality traits or financial advantages from his birth family. The child of the revolutionary age, rather than endorsing a form of succession predicted and contained by bloodline, represents a form of radical choice that defies biological ties. The child's *malleability* was precisely what made it so powerful — and so troubling for those who needed to maintain social boundaries.

In the light of emerging revolutionary sentiments, the child evoked not an inevitable plea for pity, but an inalienable claim to liberty. In the years before the Revolution, the Reverend Francis Allison, minister of the First

Presbyterian Church, argued that forcing nonconsensual servitude on adults or children was a crime. In a letter to Ezra Stiles, Allison wrote, "The Common Father of all men will severely plead a Controversy against these Colonies for Enslaving Negros and keeping their children[,] born British subjects, in perpetual slavery."[10] In this case, the language of enslaved childhood explicitly justifies claims for independence. The 1774 Continental Congress also draws on the language of heredity when it demands to know if "the descendants of Britons" plan "to tamely submit" to the machinations of Great Britain designed for the purpose of "enslaving these Colonies."[11] The difference, of course, is that Allison's formulation expands the notion of heredity beyond racialized legacies of liberty. For Allison, geography, rather than bloodline, provides the pathway to black children's claims to the same potential liberty claimed by the ethnic "descendants of Britons."[12] Rather than a victim, the child in much of the circulating revolutionary rhetoric was an individual who should demand the rights that were his by birth. The revolutionary child drew power from its temporal orientation toward an uncontainable future, and any attempt to impede its progress was inherently an act of tyranny.

John Locke's *Second Treatise of Government* — arguably the seminal representation of the revolutionary child — does indeed draw attention to a young child's weakness and vulnerability. Yet Locke insists that this dependency, rather than a disqualifier for citizenship, is instead a temporary state that obligates the stronger adults to provide safe passage to an autonomous future:

> Adam was created a perfect man, his body and mind in full possession of their strength and reason, and so was capable, from the first instant of his being to provide for his own support and preservation, and govern his actions according to the dictates of the law of reason which God had implanted in him. From him the world is peopled with his descendants, who are all born infants, weak and helpless, without knowledge or understanding: but to supply the defects of this imperfect state, till the improvement of growth and age hath removed them, Adam and Eve, and after them all parents were, by the law of nature, under an obligation to preserve, nourish, and educate the children they had begotten; not as their own workmanship, but the workmanship of their own maker, the Almighty, to whom they were to be accountable for them.[13]

What made the child so powerful — and so compelling to the North American backwaters (and indeed, to many other revolutionaries throughout the Atlantic World) — was that this definition of childhood flouted conventions not only of hereditary power, but also of physical domination. Locke's insistence that fathers must watch over their offspring potentially empowers the child — making the patriarch more guardian than ruler. A father's strength renders him a bystander to a process that he must not impede.

The revolutionary definition of the parent-child relationship demands a radical investment in potentiality. A political affiliation with the child — whether as an "infant nation," a seduced adolescent heroine, or a rebellious Son of Liberty — actually represents an incredible cognitive gamble. By positioning themselves as children who were being kept from truly "coming of age," colonists made a virtue out of powerlessness. This conception of childhood invested small bodies and unreasoning minds with the same potential rights as their fathers. For Gillian Brown, this new formulation of the child shapes much of early national rights discourse, and the legal documents that emerged from such discourse. She suggests that the U.S. Constitution's focus on protecting the rights of the individual against the majority "recognizes and codifies the simultaneous entitlement and insufficiency of childhood to which Locke wielded consent."[14] The child represents the subject who cannot yet fully enact the demands of citizenship, but will someday; therefore, the child deserves the full protection of the Constitution. One of the most prevalent, and certainly one of the most extensively circulated, conceptions of childhood in this era insisted that a child's lack of power (a lack attributable to a host of factors, including irrationality, physical weakness, and subordinate familial position) placed the impetus on those in power to provide proper guardianship of, rather than eternal authority over, that child's still unglimpsed potential.

Because the figure of the child had revolutionary associations, rhetorical links between childhood and slavery in the revolutionary era were a potent combination that threatened to topple a host of hierarchies linked to a patriarchal vision of parent-child relations. Many American revolutionaries explicitly argued that tyrannical rule over a child would turn him into a slave, breaking the Lockean contract between parent and offspring. Alexander Martin's 1769 "America, a Poem" casts the increasingly restless colony as both a youth who is being unfairly insulted and infantilized, and

as the mother of young children in danger of being enslaved. Martin, who would go on to fight in the Revolutionary War, and serve as both governor and senator for North Carolina, views Britain's lack of respect for the colony's youth as an unforgivable insult:

> New Albion's Genius am I call'd — in vain!
> When this Britannia's Sons insult my reign
> Mock my youthful years, my power deride,
> Command hard Homage with a Conqu'ror's pride,
>
> A cruel Homage! fraught with varied pains,
> With want oppression, Tyranny and Chains,
> Yes, those fierce warships, Europe's dread and hate
>
> Commission'd sail to rend my infant state,
> Lo! where they stretch tremendous o'er the waves
> To awe my free-born children into slaves.[15]

For Martin, as for many of his generation, England's choice to mock America's "youthful years" and to intimidate "free-born children" violates a mother's obligation to care for those who are in a weaker condition. Negating a child's ability to question authority was also a grave mistake. For instance, in a complaint over his imprisonment because of his alleged connection to a seditious pamphlet called *Monsters of Monsters*, Daniel Fowle argued that insisting on unquestioned obedience would lead to a state in which our "*Children perhaps may pay Reverence to a grey-headed error*," and was a sure way to "eat out the *Vitals* of that *noble Principle of Liberty*," and make the children, in effect, slaves.[16]

Slave owners and apologists were well aware of the potentially explosive analogy between slave and child. As early as 1670, the Virginia legislature effectively disqualified African children from claiming the role of child as defined by English custom. In a law designed to organize those coming into the colony without formal indenture papers — the majority of whom were under sixteen years of age — Virginia legislators insisted on the importance of determining the servants' age so that they could receive their proper terms of service. Yet while lawmakers asserted the importance of determining the age of white and Indian children, they rendered the childhood of African youth a moot point: "All servants not being Christians imported into the colony by shipping shall be slaves for their lives; but what shall

come by land shall serve, if boyes or girles until thirty years of age. If men or women twelve years."[17] Kathleen Brown points out that "Christian" early became coded as "white," effectively distinguishing English rights from African subjugation. This law in particular denies the need to differentiate African youth from African adults, thus negating the possibility of children's progression into rights and privileges. As Lucia Hodgson writes, "[i]n colonial Virginia, childhood was a racial privilege."[18]

Conversely, antislavery arguments often actively sought to connect the position of slaves with that of children. Once that connection was made, enslaved people could argue that they, like children, could move out of a state of dependency into the role of consenting adult. Brewer points out that by "continuing slavery, a birth status, the Revolutionaries either did not apply the new principles, or twisted them."[19] As David Brion Davis and others have demonstrated, both whites and blacks were acutely aware of the contradictions between revolutionary promises and slaveholding practice.[20] In a speech given before the New York Manumission Society in 1797, Samuel Miller makes an antislavery case based on the revolutionary idea of a vulnerable subject's rights. He begins his talk by refusing to fetishize the suffering of a slave — a tactic that would, however, gain great popularity in the nineteenth century. "Unwilling to wound your feelings," he declares, "by the melancholy recital, over these scenes I would willingly draw a veil; and confine myself to principles and views of the subject more immediately applicable to ourselves." He then goes on to disavow "the detestable idea, that liberty is only an advantage gained by strength, and not a right derived from Nature's God."[21] For Miller, the weak position of African slaves is an argument for their freedom, rather than a reason why they should be kept from it. In elaborating his argument, Miller draws on material children — the students of the New York African Free School (an institution I discuss in my epilogue). In a footnote, he adds that "I directed particular attention to the capacity and behavior of the scholars, with a view to satisfy myself on the point in question [the fitness of blacks to receive their freedom]. And, to me, the Negro children of that institution appeared, in general, quite as orderly, and quite as ready to learn, as white children."[22] In this case, the malleability and potentiality of childhood itself allow Miller to make the jump between black and white — place any child in the right environment, he suggests, and that child will thrive.

In contrast to conventional critical wisdom that infantilization is an in-

variably disempowering move, the revolutionary era reveals that aligning oneself with a child could be a radically liberating stance. Within a framework that made a virtue out of childhood vulnerability, and positioned childhood as a place where racial gaps might be bridged, aligning slavery and childhood could be a perilous endeavor for those invested in maintaining the institution of slavery. For to connect slaves with children in the late eighteenth century risked evoking the revolutionary argument that children are individuals whose temporary vulnerability demands care, and whose inherent potential demands freedom.

The Revolutionary Child in Saint Domingue

The inclusivity of revolutionary rhetoric — along with the galvanizing figure of the revolutionary child — was subject to a radically different set of pressures during the explosive slave rebellion in Saint Domingue. The Haitian Revolution sent shockwaves throughout the slave-owning world, and was particularly devastating to slaveholding Americans. David Brion Davis contends, "Like the Hiroshima bomb, its meaning could be rationalized or repressed but never really forgotten since it demonstrated the possible fate of every slaveholding society in the New World. The Haitian Revolution impinged in one way or another on the entire emancipation debate, from the British parliamentary move in 1792 to outlaw the African slave trade to Brazil's final abolition of slavery ninety-six years later."[23] And, perhaps in line with white readers' terrified need to make sense of such an earth-shaking event — one in which "slaves defeated not only their masters, but the most formidable armies of Spain, Britain and France" — the rhetoric describing the revolution in Saint Domingue relied heavily on images of suffering children.[24] While a comprehensive analysis of the child metaphors deployed in the Haitian Revolution is beyond the scope of this study, a brief examination of how the child victim was appropriated by both black and white writers in response to the revolution illustrates the larger claim of this chapter — that the problems of racial slavery helped to initiate a shift from Revolutionary rhetoric's depiction of childhood as a site of potential to an increased emphasis on a child's vulnerability and potential victimhood. Within the conflicted rhetoric of the Haitian Revolution, the child victim became a morally pivotal position. If the rebels could be aligned with the unfairly repressed colonial children found in the Americas, their cause would

take on the imprimatur of righteous rebellion. Thus white antirebel writers took pains to flip that equation — providing detailed atrocity narratives in which the black rebels are seen as savage enemies of helpless infants.

As Laurent Dubois, Robin Blackburn, and others have noted, the slave rebellion in Haiti took inspiration from the revolutionary rhetoric of the era, as well as from their own experience, and from African traditions. Dubois, for example, points to the possessions found on one fallen rebel: pamphlets about the rights of man, explosives and a voudou fetish.[25] Many of the leaders of the rebellion certainly saw themselves as participating in the same revolutionary spirit — in which besieged children righteously rose up against tyrannical parents — as their French and American counterparts. It should not be surprising, then, that descriptions of a revolution that posited no shared relationships of blood or culture between rebels and masters nonetheless cast revolutionaries as ungrateful children. In a 1791 poem written about the conflict and published in the French newspaper *Moniteur Général*, the poet charges black slaves with the murder of their father-masters:

> But what horde of rebels
> Rushes maddened to carnage
> In his cruel hands, the Slave
> Carries the torch and death.
> Stop, tool of parricide[26]

In this exchange, equating blacks with children — even parricidal children — places them within a metaphorical system that had traversed the Atlantic, and in which the child had been figured as an unjustly repressed and therefore righteously rebellious subject. Calling these rebelling slave-children parricides creates striking parallels with the charges leveled against both American and French revolutionaries. Between 1792 and 1794, Lynn Avery Hunt argues, "radical iconography [in France] instantiated a new family romance of fraternity: brothers and sisters appeared frequently in this iconographic outpouring, mothers rarely, and fathers almost never."[27] And of course, in France the metaphorical charge of revolutionary parricide had became literalized in the French revolutionaries' execution of the king. Similarly, U.S. colonists had often been figured as parent-killers, although quite often that parent was figured a mother as well as a father.[28] On one level, the metaphor linking child to slave provides conceptual grounding that would equate the Haitian rebels with their French and American

counterparts, who had also been accused of patricide. By figuring the rebellious slaves as parricides, the comparison also changes the terms of debate substantially. Whereas American and French revolutionaries were often reminded of their blood ties to the mother country, Haitian rebels had no such ancestral ties. Yet the rhetorical maneuver in this poem works to override the arguments of race and bloodline by tapping into the powerful momentum that the position of subordination — represented through the figure of an unjustly oppressed child — possessed in the age of revolution.

So dangerously powerful was this equation of child and slave that much of the proslavery literature surrounding the events of Saint Domingue explicitly sought to reconfigure the slaves — as strange as it might seem — as royalist fathers, rather than as rebellious children. As Jeremy Popkin points out, one of the more famous first-hand accounts of the Haitian Revolution, Gros's *Historick Recital, of the Different Occurrences*, was mined for evidence that "the Saint Domingue rebellion was actually part of a royalist plot." Gros insists that the slave owners' ruin could be due to nothing else "but the stroke of the *counter-revolutionary aristocrats*."[29] To return to the poem published in the *Moniteur Général*, the next few lines suggest that the parricidal blacks are merely the instruments of those who wish to actually reestablish a royalist patriarchal order:

> Stop tool of parricide,
> An invisible and perfidious hand
> Guides you only to horrible defeats,
> And the only outcome of so much crime
> Will be to weep for your victims
> Under the weight of your new chains.[30]

The invisible hand, according to Gros and others, was that of the royalist fathers who orchestrated the rebellion in order to reassert their tyrannous rule over all their colonial children. As simply the "tool" of parricide, the rebels become instead the instrument of those who, by virtue of shared blood, can be accused of child murder. In this formulation, the rebels are denied the claim to the rebellious child, and instead occupy an older definition of childhood. In this revised version of an old formulation, the rebels are cast as subservient and unthinking puppets who could not help but bow to parental wishes.

As this poem suggests, writers articulated the stakes of the Saint

Domingue revolution and the justice of the rebels' cause through the filter of the imperiled child. If the slaves were aligned with the child who was unfairly oppressed, the conceptual link between American, French, and Haitian revolutionaries could be established. Abraham Bishop, a Connecticut admirer of the rebels' cause, argued for equivalence between the American and Haitian revolutions. Both struggles, for him, were about the rights of unfairly suppressed colonial children to rise up and demand their rights: "The cry of the poor wretches, who are now fighting for their liberties and lives, for their wives and children, has gone up into the ears of the God of Sabbaoth. He had promised to hear the cry of the prisoner and the oppressed."[31] Although he knew his sentiments placed him in the minority in the United States, Bishop argued that the Haitians were "entitled to freedom," an assertion "founded on the American Declaration of Independence: — Upon the language of our petitions to the English courts, at the commencement of the late war: — Upon the spirit of freedom, which animated and conducted to victory, the American army."[32] Theodore Dwight, brother of Timothy Dwight, similarly argued that the Haitian rebels' case was analogous to the American rebels'.[33]

One of the most effective ways to delegitimize the rebels' cause was to paint those rebels as diametrically opposed to the threatened child victim — as baby killers. The atrocity narratives that came out of Saint Domingue represent another chapter in a long-standing tradition in which infanticide emerges as the very emblem of barbarity. As I have discussed in my first two chapters, the figure of the murdered white child captive functioned as an emotional linchpin in narratives that sought to demonize Indian captors. The trope of the infanticidal savage has ancient roots. As I have been arguing throughout this study, however, the very commonality of the figure of the suffering child rendered that figure particularly agile for mapping old conceptions onto the New World's problems. In this case, the scene of infanticide divides the savage and the civilized along racial lines. As in the Indian captivity narratives, the portrayal of white child victims telegraphs the vulnerability many whites felt when faced with the prospect of slave uprising. When considered in light of the importance that childhood vulnerability held in revolutionary rhetoric, the prominence of the child victim in accounts of Haiti does more than simply render the slaves savages — it works to recalibrate the meanings attached to childhood in a revolutionary context.

In the American and French revolutions, the child was the actor (heroic or criminal, depending on one's perspective). As white writers struggled to disqualify blacks from accessing the potential power of the revolutionary child, they would have to refigure the child as a site of passive suffering at the hands of insurgents. One of the most widely circulated images to emerge out of the Saint Domingue revolution was of a white baby impaled on a bayonet and carried by insurgents as a macabre standard for their marches. Bryan Edwards's accounts soon spread word of the alleged barbarity of the rebels, a move that further disqualified them from the position of rightfully rebellious child and instead placed them in the role of tyrannical adult. In one account of the "unfortunate" Madame Sejourné, Edwards echoes scenes of ravished pregnant women that occurred in many American Indian captivity narratives — a genre that similarly thrived on an opposition, rather than an alliance, between the child and the "savage":[34] "This unfortunate woman (my hand trembles while I write) was far advanced in her pregnancy. The monsters, whose prisoner she was, having first murdered her husband in her presence, ripped her up alive, and threw the infant to the hogs."[35] Coupled with the popular insistence that black rebels were working on behalf of royalist fathers back in France, their storied hostility toward children disqualifies them for revolutionary childhood, marking them instead as murderous tyrants. Once the power and perseverance of the Haitian rebels became clear, Thomas Jefferson, for one, cast them as an explicit threat to American children. In 1793, Jefferson wrote worriedly to James Monroe: "I become daily more and more convinced that all the West India islands will remain in the hands of the people of colour, and a total expulsion of the whites sooner or later take place. It is high time we should foresee the bloody scenes which our children certainly, and possibly ourselves (South of Patowmac) have to wade through, and try to avert them."[36]

Reflecting the influence and inspiration of the revolutionary ideology of America and France, the Haitian rebels themselves often sought to enfold themselves within existing narratives of righteously rebelling children. In so doing, they sought to literalize the promise of the revolutionary child in unprecedented ways — calling the bluff of white fathers who wanted to contain the meanings of the child within certain racial and gendered parameters. While much of the discourse in the American Revolution complained of England as a tyrannical parent who refused her colonial child the freedom to exercise consent, in Haiti, the besieged child often emerged as an

orphan figure — neglected, abandoned, and disinherited. The first iteration of nationhood in Haiti — the admittedly short-lived 1805 constitution — is remarkable for its nearly poetic investment in metaphors of family, and in particular in representations of just relations between parents and children.[37] The very first full sentence of the 1805 Haitian Constitution explicitly lays claim to the promise of natural rights by casting the Haitian people as neglected children who have come to claim their inheritance:[38]

> [We sign this document] as well in our name as in that of the people of Hayti, who have legally constituted us faithfully as organs and interpreters of their will, in presence of the Supreme Being, before whom all mankind are equal, and who has scattered so many species of creatures on the surface of the earth for the purpose of manifesting his glory and his power by the diversity of his works, in the presence of all nature by whom we have been so unjustly and for so long a time considered as outcast children.[39]

Questions of inheritance, and the balance of familial power it mediates, emerge several times in the document. Article 10, for instance, forbids mothers and fathers from disinheriting their children. Article 9 states that no "person is worthy of being a Haitian who is not a good father, good son, a good husband, and especially a good soldier." These formulations respond to the complex questions of the mixed racial descent particular to Haiti, which the writers sought to enfold within egalitarian familial metaphors inspired by the natural rights doctrine that undergirded both the French and American revolutions. In the country the constitution writers wished to create, good fathers and good sons are equally important. What constitutes good fatherhood or proper filial duty is largely left unarticulated, but can be glimpsed through the document's emphasis on inheritance. By forbidding mothers and fathers from disinheriting their children, the constitution confronts and dismantles a key weapon in hierarchal parent-child relations. In this vision of a new nation, property cannot be withheld from offspring as a means of eliciting obedience. Rather, the relationship between good fathers and good sons evokes the egalitarian model articulated in both French and American revolutionary doctrine. The inclusion of good husbands in the national nomenclature further reinforces a vision of consent and reciprocity held up in Atlantic revolutionary doctrine. As Jan Lewis has argued, portraits of egalitarian marriage often vied with models of revolutionary childhood as the emblem of the new revolutionary order.[40]

Touissant L'Ouverture himself often reached for the metaphor of neglected children when speaking of fellow blacks. In a letter written to Dieudonne, who was in negotiations with the British about possibly opposing the rebels, L'Ouverture admonishes him for standing between a parent country and the colonial child she is finally ready to acknowledge: "Can it be possible," he asks, "that at the very moment when France triumphs over all the royalists and recognizes us for her children . . . that you should let yourself be deceived by our ancient tyrants?"[41] In his *Haytian Papers*, Prince Saunders, the Connecticut-born son of a slave and Revolutionary soldier, explicitly wrote of Haitians in terms that echoed the war his father fought in. Written by an American émigré to Haiti to encourage African American immigration, and published in England, the text exemplifies the transnational reach of the Haitian uprising, and its ideological investment in revolutionary concepts like the righteously rebellious child.

Like white Americans, Saunders suggests that the Haitians could rightfully be seen as children who, if only treated with the respect and fairness that were due them, would embrace the mother country against whom they had been forced to rebel. Indeed, a main point of contention is the French Counsel's General's refusal to share information with the Haitians. By doing so, France behaves like a tyrannical parent, keeping her colonial "children" ignorant of the laws to which they insisted they needed to consent: "[There are] laws promised to us, by the mother country, by the proclamation that her Counsul's have addressed to us when they communicated the constitution of the 8th year. Fulfill, Citizen General, this maternal promise, by unfolding to our view the code which contains it, and you will soon behold all her children rushing into the arms of that beneficent mother and among them General Touissant L'Ouverture."[42] A few pages later, Saunders reiterates his plea for the mother country to treat her "children" as agents who deserve to know about — and consent to — the laws prescribed to them. "The exposure of these laws," Saunders writes, "will stop the effusion of French blood by Frenchmen; will restore to the Republic children who may yet do her service."[43] Saunders clearly subscribed to the Enlightenment belief in the potential of childhood and the power of education. He eventually took on the role as education minister of Haiti, where he instituted several schools under the Lancasterian method (the same method that would be employed in New York and elsewhere to educate poor children, including the children of slaves).

The use of the suffering child in representations of the Haitian Revolution offers yet another example of how metaphors of besieged children enfold radically novel situations into familiar narratives. Yet, here, as in the other conflicts I have discussed, the demands of New World conditions cause the repetition of ancient tropes to emerge with a significant difference. While antirevolutionary writers used the white child victim in atrocity accounts to render the black rebels savage, the appropriation of the child by the rebels themselves results in a new formulation of the revolutionary child as filtered through the lens of slavery. For black Haitians, the crime of the mother country was not primarily a lack of respect for her children's right to consent. Rather the crime was her inability to see blacks as her children in the first place. If American revolutionary children were being held too tightly, black revolutionary children were tired of being kept at arm's length. In a Haitian context, the revolutionary child emerges as an orphan demanding his due. As we shall see, this figuration of the orphaned and neglected slave child emerges powerfully in the United States as well — and takes on additional emotional power as the material circumstances of actual slave children further alter the palette of meanings attached to suffering children — and by extension, the range of critiques available against misused power.

Looking Back in Anguish — the Revolutionary Child's Transformation into the Suffering Slave Child

At the end of the eighteenth century, then, the rhetorical pairing of blackness and childhood *could* be a provocative, empowering model — so empowering that whites took pains to dismantle it in response to the problems raised by the Haitian Revolution. In little more than a generation, however, fusing the child with the slave had become a common ploy of slavery apologists (as well as abolitionists such as Harriet Beecher Stowe). This conceptual shift occurred as the definitions of the slave and the child shaped each other. As part of this shift, the temporal orientation of childhood — as a Lockean investment in futurity — realigned backwards. Rather than an emblem of yet-unrealized potential, the child came to embody a level of permanent dependence. Once the child emerged as a subject entirely locked in the present moment — a moment defined through a profound sense of utter vulnerability and imminent victimization — the incipient rights and privileges of

radical potentiality could be conceptually detached from the child, and the slave to whom that child was increasingly linked.

How did the child's revolutionary political valence dissipate? How did the underage child — who in revolutionary terminology merited respect and accommodation — become the harbinger of inescapable subjection and suffering? One answer, of course, is that whites merely moved blacks to the noncitizen side of the ledger by portraying them as incapable of self-government and consent. But I suggest that the process was not that simple. Instead, writers and thinkers had to account for the postrevolutionary subjugation of slaves within a cognitive and emotional framework that could sustain the premise. As in other infantilizing metaphors evoked in the early republic, the slave-child pairing was not new. As historian Orlando Patterson has written, "the degraded man-child" figure has been a rhetorical "imperative of all systems of slavery."[44] As I have been arguing, the very universality of infantilizing metaphors in systems of despotic power does not mean that the same thing simply happens over and over. Rather, the well-worn groove of the degraded child victim helps us to chart the points of encounter — as old systems of belief and understanding confront the changing material and conceptual demands of American colonization and nation-building.

In the case of American slavery, the painful experiences of enslaved children were a key, if largely unacknowledged, factor in shaping the early republican version of the slave child. Black writers' ability to articulate their own childhood experiences helped initiate an important cultural turning point in Americans' emotional engagement with the child. The child-slave metaphor in early America was forged and refined amid the interplay between black experience and white formulations of childhood. This interplay, I suggest, helps to explain the investment in suffering childhood that allowed Stowe's wildly popular Little Eva — a privileged little white child — to modulate so effectively the discourses of guilty white witness to the traumas of slavery *and* the cult of childhood suffering.

As Thomas Laquer, Karen Halttunen, and others have argued, the sentimental formula, as practiced by Stowe and others, depends on the visible suffering of victims to garner sympathy from readers.[45] Without Uncle Tom's suffering to cry over, the argument runs, white readers would have little connection to the injustice of slavery. Critics such as Gabrielle Foreman have argued persuasively that black writers have cannily engaged — and undermined — the sentimental formula that fetishized black suffering and

rendered black characters perpetual children.[46] I would add an additional layer to this dynamic to suggest that the experience of enslaved people (sometimes articulated in early African American writing, at other times expressed in oral tradition, and still others simply witnessed by whites) actually altered the way the child functioned in the public sphere in ways that white writers would then appropriate. Put simply then, we misread sentimental literature if we imagine it as a purely white form that imposed its vaguely sadomasochistic eye on largely helpless blacks. Instead, we need to consider how this literature, with its lingering emphasis on lost and suffering children, can be understood as a response to the sharp points of affective and conceptual encounter created by the experiences of slavery and slave children in the United States.

Richard Brodhead was one of the first critics to demonstrate connections between sensationalized tableaus of slavery and larger cultural ideas about childhood. When white readers in the nineteenth century "saw" a slave being whipped in print, he suggests, they were inevitably returned to the questions of corporal punishment that were emerging in conversations about education and discipline. For Brodhead, white middle-class ideals about gently disciplining children were both reimagined and reinstantiated through a cultural obsession with scenes of whippings in antislavery narratives, in naval reform literature, and in educational and childrearing material. In other words, the abuses of slavery provided a dramatic and compelling instance of examining — and rejecting — corporal punishment as a system of household discipline.

Scenes of slavery's violence did evoke ideas about child discipline for white readers, but slavery did not only show whites "a scene they already wanted to see" — a scene that they were struggling with *apart* from slavery's influence. We cannot overlook the influence that slaves themselves had on U.S. conceptualizations of domestic power and, in particular, figurations of the child. The material experiences of slavery — as described by slaves themselves, but also inevitably witnessed by white onlookers — made childhood itself a position that "naturally" accrued associations with unjust suffering. Slave children suffered mightily and in large numbers. As David Brion Davis writes, even "those historians and economists who have tended to give a more benign picture of slave living standards have had to recognize that planter self-interest did not prevent a ghastly slave infant mortality rate or the serious malnutrition of slave children."[47] In addition to the death

and suffering slave children endured because of poor nutrition and ill care, the psychologically compelling scenes of separation and trauma that were experienced by so many enslaved children undoubtedly gained visibility and cultural purchase as both the scenes themselves increased, and as slave narratives describing those scenes in the first person began to circulate in greater numbers at the end of the eighteenth century.

Historians only have recently begun to appreciate how extensively young children were involved in the slave trade. As any modern relief worker can attest, the most vulnerable members of the community are bound to suffer in greatest proportion during any forced migration. This was certainly true of African children who suffered devastating horror during the slave trade. Wilma King's work has done much to document the inevitably elusive experience of children in slavery by examining the accounts of slave voyages. What she finds is a devastating portrait of how many children were shaped by violent separation and brutal conditions from a very young age. For instance, the slaveship *Margarita* sailed from Africa in 1734 with a cargo of enslaved people — 87 percent of whom were under the age of sixteen. The average age on that particular voyage was about thirteen. In 1790 the *Marietta* sailed with eight crew members and eighty Africans. Ninety percent were listed as children. The *Henrietta Marie* had over eighty pairs of shackles designed expressly for children's hands.[48]

Carole Shammas has shown that enslaved women in early colonial Virginia outnumbered English servant women in several Virginia counties. Bound African women also outnumbered bound Indian women for the majority of the seventeenth century. At least in colonial Virginia, then, slave mothers could well have outnumbered white or Indian mothers.[49] Indeed, Kathleen M. Brown argues that the statistical significance of African mothers accounts for the early legal focus on these women and their offspring — a focus that contradicted hundreds of years of precedent and rendered the mother's condition the determinant of a child's future status.[50]

Recent historical work suggests the number of children taken in the slave trade from some West African countries approaches 25 percent of the whole. More conservative estimates put the number closer to ten percent.[51] David Eltis's most recent work on the epic Transatlantic Slave Database has indicated that as the nineteenth century progressed, almost fifty percent of the slaves carried on slave ships were children, often as young as seven or eight years old.[52] In any case, when we consider that over twelve million enslaved

people were carried to the Western Hemisphere, even the most conservative estimate asserts that millions of enslaved people experienced the American slave trade as children. Undoubtedly, millions of children grew up within the system of slavery in the United States. So, not surprisingly, as Africans narrated their experience, childhood took center stage. The demands of writing about a slave childhood demanded a new lexicon of suffering, which often stretched existing conceptions of interiority in ways that pushed for a new definition of childhood itself. Rethinking childhood, in turn, involved rethinking about the political, cognitive, and affective structures that were propped on ideas about the child.

It has become a critical commonplace that life writing necessarily borrows from existing conventions. There was ample Anglo-American precedent for describing childhood suffering, yet much of this writing considered a child's pain from an adult perspective. In addition to the sermons, captivity narratives, and seduction novels I have analyzed, there was an entire field of poetry dedicated to describing — and, hopefully, ameliorating — the pain of losing a child. Anne Bradstreet is perhaps the most widely anthologized American author of child mourning poems — a tradition carried on well into the nineteenth century by Lydia Sigourney, among others. Phillis Wheatley writes several poems in this vein, gently chiding the parents of "Nancy," who died when five years old, not to indulge in excessive sorrow. Usually, when writing of white Christian children, the poems gently remonstrate the parents for their grief:

> Perfect in bliss she from her heav'nly home
> Looks down, and smiling beckons you to come;
> Why then, fond parents, why these fruitless groans?
> Restrain your tears, and cease your plaintive moans.
> Freed from a world of sin, and snares, and pain,
> Why would you wish your daughter back again?[53]

The child, after all, has been taken by the Divine Hand, whose will cannot be questioned. And of course, the poem implies, there is the chance of heaven, a form of happiness far superior than any that could be provided even by a loving mother's arms.

The slave trade demands a different framework to convey its form of loss, and to formulate the mourning appropriate to such a loss. The separation that occurs through the slave trader is decidedly *not* providential, and

it is quite clear that the child is going to suffer greatly in its new environment. No longer ephemeral — indeed, all too bodily — this new imagined child demands a certain form of subjectivity that finds its foundation in loss — both her own, and her parents'. Wheatley offers an image strikingly different than the smiling white babe secure in heavenly bliss when describing her own childhood:

> I, young in life, by seeming cruel fate
> Was snatch'd from Afric's fancy'd happy seat:
> What pangs excruciating must molest,
> What sorrows labour in my parent's breast?
> Steel'd was that soul and by no misery mov'd
> That from a father seiz'd his babe belov'd.[54]

The slave child is, by definition, born of suffering. Saidya Hartman has said that scenes of whipping function as the "bloodstained gate," the primal scene that inaugurates slave subjectivity. Yet in the eighteenth century, scenes of childhood separation and orphanhood often received more affective weight in many slave narratives than scenes of physical punishment did. For Phillis Wheatley, Olaudah Equiano, Venture Smith, and many others, the scene where a child loses his parents is the primal scene of slavery. It is a scene that demands a new attention to the pain of childhood loss. Children in these narratives are subjects, not objects, of mourning, separation, and suffering. In a strikingly different formulation than the numerous descriptions of suffering and dying childhood that had circulated in Anglo-American writing, slave writers insisted on describing the child's position in the first person.

In their cumulative emphasis on childhood and its meanings, black narrators were participating in a larger conversation about subjectivity predicated on childhood suffering. The underlying philosophy of much life writing — that individuals progressed from one state to another, gradually discovering an interiority that unfolds along with life's experience — placed a new emphasis on individual origins. As Locke, Rousseau, and others looked to the child to answer questions about mankind's natural state, individual writers looked to their own childhood to provide the telos of the individual they would become. As Stephen Carl Arch has suggested, the autobiographical impulse in the eighteenth century emanated in great part from figures who felt themselves marginalized, and who were trying to make sense of

themselves within a system that dehumanized them.[55] So perhaps it should come as little surprise that many of these stories begin with a childhood that was decidedly less than ideal.

Reading early black writers as a body of work that straddles the divide between the powerful revolutionary child and the traumatized slave child allows us to alter the map of cultural and literary influence when we approach the work of sentimental literature with its emphasis on orphaned and suffering childhood. In order to understand the ways in which early black writers first engaged the revolutionary child, and then reformulated existing tropes of childhood to accommodate black experience, I juxtapose the work of two eighteenth-century slave narrators, Olaudah Equiano and Venture Smith, with what might well be considered the ur-text of revolutionary childhood, *The Autobiography* of Benjamin Franklin. Critics and teachers have long found useful points of comparison between Equiano's and Franklin's texts. Both works draw from the circulating colonial drama of a child separating from parents. These two men — a founding father and a self-emancipated slave — exist at different ends of the spectrum of power in the late eighteenth century. And in many ways, the narratives of both men play out within the trajectory allotted to the revolutionary child. For both Equiano and Franklin, leaving their homes and parents behind ultimately allows them to cultivate their own capacities for commerce, intellect, and interpersonal networking to achieve a potential that would have been unrealized if they had stayed. Both men leave home at an early age, both are remarkably intelligent, and both are savvy networkers. As Vincent Carretta points out, Equiano's text predates Franklin's, so while many college professors like to frame Equiano as a "black Franklin," it perhaps makes more sense to figure Franklin as a white Equiano.[56] Most important for this study, both of these texts narrate the tale of the revolutionary child, who must detach from parental care and control in order to step into his own power. Yet, of course, the terms of that separation vary widely along racial lines, as does the affect attached to it.

A Lockean exemplar, Franklin seems aware, almost from birth, of his claims to agency and freedom, despite his youth and vulnerability. From the beginning, Franklin fashions his child-self as inherently separate from his father's wishes. His father wants help with his candle-making work; young Benjamin does not like it. His father wants his son to avoid the sea; young

Benjamin is continually "in and about it."[57] And the child here is not only able to learn to swim and navigate; he is an agent, capable of leading others. Franklin tells the story (foreshadowing his later career as a civic leader) of being "allow'd to govern" the other children, and directing them to "build a Wharf there fit for us to stand upon."[58] Although he suggests that his father "corrects" him, he seems little daunted by paternal disapproval. When writing about his deceased parents, Franklin acknowledges their loss with a physical monument over which he has complete control. The long gravestone epitaph that he includes in his narrative inscribed by "[t]heir youngest son, [i]n filial regard to their memory," testifies not just to Franklin's filial duty, but also to his command over his parents' memory. The son here oversees the content and meaning of his parents' story, and has the power to literally carve his version into stone.[59]

The process of being bound out in apprenticeship likewise casts the child-Franklin as an agent and master of his future destiny, even as he is placed in a dependent position. He casts himself as resistant to the desire of his father, and depicts his child-self as having the final word in the decision-making process: "I stood out some time," he tells us, "but at last was persuaded, and signed the Indentures, when I was yet but twelve years old."[60] Of course, this apprenticeship leads to another separation, again initiated by a child-Franklin who wants to move beyond the bounds of his current situation. Looking toward the future, the underage Franklin decides to try to further his career as a printer, and sets off for New York, and eventually for Philadelphia — no mean journey from Boston for a young lad with little money and no connections.

Notably, Franklin has his own fitful passage by water to the site of his eventual independence. He suffers from a squall, terrible thirst, and a nagging fever, and arrives in the city considerably worse for wear. There would be no choicer moment to express a desire for home, and perhaps, for the solicitations of a caring mother. Yet Franklin rebounds and prospers, entirely due to his own capacity for reason and learning. He cures his fever with a remedy learned from a book (lots of water) and makes his first connection because his adult interlocutor is impressed with both his charm and his learning. He soon lays the ground for the incredible network of friends and mentors that would enable his stellar climb. In the process of painting the portrait of his own success, Franklin cannily creates a child figure who

exemplifies the most ambitious renderings of the revolutionary child as a figure of burgeoning potential.

As Vincent Carretta and others have argued, Olaudah Equiano has a spectacular claim to the honor of being a self-made man.[61] Against larger odds than Franklin faced, Equiano raises himself from slavery to a life of prosperity, honor, and international renown. Yet the portrait of that journey could not be more different than Franklin's narrative. Designed to highlight the evils of slavery, as well as to provide a remarkable success story, Equiano's narrative requires a different representation of childhood. His child-self is infinitely vulnerable to the suffering occasioned by adults who refuse to provide the care he so desperately needs. Indeed, his initial capture, and the great suffering that follows, is brought about because "none of the grown people were nigh."[62] The absence of adults is rendered essential to the scene — immediately previous to the scene in which Equiano is taken, we are told of a similar kidnapping attempt, which was foiled because of the strength and vigilance of adult members of the tribe. The tragedy occurs when two children are left home alone, a task to which they are clearly not equal: "One day, when all our people were gone out to their works as usual, and only I and my dear sister were left to mind the house, two men and a woman got over our walls, and in a moment seized us both, and, without giving us time to cry out, or make resistance, they stopped our mouths, and ran off with us into the nearest wood."[63] The circumstances of Equiano's kidnapping make a case for a child's dependence on adult protection. Unlike Franklin, when Equiano is left on his own his victimhood becomes inevitable. His subjugation to the adults who implicitly neglect him and overtly abuse him could not be clearer. For Franklin, the act of separation is a giddy moment of independence. For Equiano, and for other enslaved narrators, it is a moment of irreparable psychic damage. Equiano's physical vulnerability, his great fear and mourning, and his lack of adequate knowledge with which to cope with the situation combine to create a portrait of a child subject who is defined by his unmet needs, violently exposed vulnerability, and inability to move forward from the trauma that initiates his entry into this new world.

In early slave narratives, the shock of separation and the hardship that follows it often create a deep nostalgic longing for the lost parent (often, but not always, a mother). Equiano, for one, describes himself as "very fond of his mother, and almost constantly with her."[64] Denied the opportunity

that Franklin uses to such good effect, Equiano's childhood self is fashioned through visceral maternal longing that extends both before and after the primal scene of separation. His yearning for his mother is retroactively projected into his early childhood, during which he casts himself as inseparable from a mother who dotes on him without restraint. His attachment is so great, in fact, that he transgresses his culture's insistence on separation: "Those that touched the dead at any time were obliged to wash and purify themselves before they could enter a dwelling-house. Every woman too, at certain times, was forbidden to come into a dwelling-house, or touch any person, or any thing we ate." Equiano, however, cannot stay away from his mother. "I was so fond of my mother I could not keep from her, or avoid touching her at some of those periods, in consequence of which I was obliged to be kept out with her, in a little house made for that purpose, till offering was made, and then we were purified."[65]

The intensity of the mother-child bond here leads Equiano's biographer to suggest that Equiano might have his dates confused. Equiano may be describing an earlier period in his life, Carretta suggests, because the portrait Equiano provides of his eleven-year-old self strikes his biographer as "quite immature."[66] And perhaps he was immature by modern ideals of child development, with their emphasis on growing independence. However, such fondness between parent and child — even older ones — would become an idealized model by the mid-nineteenth century, particularly in sentimental literature (a genre that, not coincidentally, often showcased an orphan child's longing for a lost parent).

Equiano's desire for his lost parents, and for the homeland they occupied, is echoed in several other narratives. Quobna Ottobah Cugoano laments being "early snatched away from my native country."[67] James Albert Ukawsaw Gronniosaw's 1772 narrative speaks with great longing of his "dear indulgent mother" who respected his childish inquisitiveness, and speaks of the "misery that would have been inexpressible" if he had realized at the time that he was to be separated from her forever.[68] Venture Smith's 1798 narrative is noted for its decidedly unsentimental emphasis on wealth-building. However, he acknowledges that the moment of violent separation from his father had far-reaching consequences, even into a future that would hold freedom and considerable prosperity. He tells the reader that "[t]he shocking scene" of his father's death and his own kidnapping "is to this day fresh in my mind, and I have often been overcome while thinking on it."[69] For

Smith, as for many early slave narrators, the scene of separation is never far from one's present consciousness, threatening to "overcome" the efforts to move forward into adulthood.

Early black narratives were often written through the labors of a white amanuensis and, of course, white publishers and readers were always instrumental in the publication process. The ongoing controversy about the historical basis of Equiano's *Interesting Narrative* also raises questions about how to interpret his moving description of his own childhood.[70] I suggest, along with Carretta and others, that the figure of the stolen slave child Equiano portrays did represent a pervasive historical reality. Even if Equiano himself did not experience the African kidnapping he describes, he nonetheless spoke for countless children who had experienced sudden, often violent separation from their parents. To be sure, if Equiano himself was not torn from his mother, his very birth in the United States (if that is the case) ensures that one of his ancestors certainly was. The WPA interviews, focusing on a far later generation of American-born slaves, still echo the separation mourned by Wheatley, Equiano, and contemporaries. Moses Mitchell, speaking of his nineteenth-century childhood in slavery, remembered being sold away from his family forever: "I was twelve years old then and I stayed in Texas until I was 48. When they took us to Texas, they left my mother and baby sister here in Arkansas, down here on Oak Log Bayou. I never saw her again and when I came back her to Arkansas, they said she had been dead twenty-eight years. Never did hear of my father again."[71] George Taylor Burns had his words embellished by his interviewer who clearly strove to convey a sense of utter heartbreak: "Old Master died that winter and many slaves were sold by their heirs, among them was Lucy Burns [George's mother]. Little George clung to his mother but strong hands tore away his clasp. Then he watched her cross a distant hill, chained to a long line of departing slaves. George never saw his parents again."[72] For Equiano, the forcible separation from his family diminishes all his future prospects. His remembered goodbyes to his sister reach forward in time to shape the development and range of his future emotions:

> Yes, thou dear partner of all my childish sports! thou sharer of my joys and sorrows! happy should I have ever esteemed myself to encounter every misery for you, and to procure your freedom by the sacrifice of my own. Though you were early forced from my arms, your image has been always riveted in

> my heart, from which neither *time nor fortune* have been able to remove it; so that, while the thoughts of your sufferings have damped my prosperity, they have mingled with adversity and increased its bitterness.[73]

And indeed, much of Equiano's narrative unfolds as a quixotic quest to find a replacement for the family he lost. Like Franklin, Equiano is able to make several useful connections. Unlike Franklin, he is unable to maintain them. Much of his narrative chronicles the protagonist continually undergoing separations that echo his initial devastating loss. His first stop after being separated from his sister is at the house of "a chieftain, in a pleasant country. This man had two wives and some children, and they all used me extremely well, and did all they could to comfort me; particularly the first wife, who was something like my mother."[74] After enduring a second separation from his sister, Equiano views his next owners as, again, a replacement family. He is surprised when they allow him to eat with them as an equal. "Indeed," he writes, "every thing here, and their treatment of me, made me forget that I was a slave. In this resemblance to my happy former state, I passed about two months; and now I began to think I was adopted into the family."[75] Of course, that hope vanishes, as Equiano is "awakened out of [his] reverie to fresh sorrow, and hurried away even amongst the uncircumcised."[76] When Equiano becomes an officer's servant in the Royal Navy, he looks to his fellow seaman to fill the void created by his separation from his homeland. "Most important," Carretta suggests, "he once again appeared to be in a stable relationship with an adult male figure of authority. The orphaned little boy quickly attached himself emotionally to the man who had bought him, and who, Equiano assumed, reciprocated that emotional attachment."[77]

Equiano also seems to find several people who fill the relationship of a sister. He speaks of a little white girl "six or seven years of age," who "grew prodigiously fond" of him — so much so that "[they] used to eat together, and had servants to wait on us. I was so much caressed by this family that it often reminded me of the treatment I had received from my little African master."[78] Equiano's later relationship with the Guerin sisters, with whom he had "become a favorite," and who "took much notice and great care of [him]," also seems to supply the warmth of a sisterly, if not maternal, relationship.[79] His attempts to secure a replacement family, however, are repeatedly foiled, and he finds himself continually returned to moments of painful separation.

White Readings of the Black Child

Much has been written about how well-intentioned white abolitionists have appropriated the words of enslaved people, effectively writing over black authenticity. The relationship between Frederick Douglass and William Lloyd Garrison is often invoked to demonstrate the patronizing attitude white abolitionists had toward their black colleagues. White abolitionist John Collins was perhaps the most explicit in his delineation of the role Douglass should play. "Give us the facts," Collins told him, "we will take care of the philosophy."[80] Undoubtedly, whites did manipulate black experience. Perhaps, however, in our haste to chastise patronizing white writers for their appropriation of black narrative, we overlook how vitally important that narrative was to the cultural shifts that abolitionism and sentimentalism helped to initiate. After all, without Douglass's story there was no material with which Collins might philosophize. Moving past how stories of black children have been appropriated allows us to place new attention on the experiences of actual black children. In turn, foregrounding the lives and work of enslaved people allows us to trace the ways white writers on both sides of the slavery debate owed their "philosophy" — in this case, specific but remarkably powerful conceptions of childhood — to the experiences of Africans in America.

Black writers helped to reshape the trope of the suffering child as they sought to give voice to their own experience. White writers, in turn, tried to reappropriate and refigure these images in ways that justified their own purposes. Abolitionist writers were the most obviously indebted to black formulations of childhood suffering. Joshua Peel, English preacher and poet, explicitly cites Equiano as both the inspiration and the historical anchor for his meditation on the slave child's anguish. The third stanza of his poem "On the African Slave Trade" roots a general scene of childhood pain to the specific tale Equiano has told:

> Infants are stole, and from their parents torn,
> As if for wo[e] the innocent was born:
> Young boys and girls, when at their homes at play,
> Are also caught, and kinapp'd far away.

Peel attached a footnote to this stanza that read "See the Life of Olaudah Equiano (afterwards called Gustavus Vassa), written by himself."[81]

Of course the most famous and influential abolitionist document of all was Harriet Beecher Stowe's 1852 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, a novel that featured children at its heart. The story of Topsy, Eva, little George, and the infantilized Uncle Tom created extraordinary global sales and intensely politicized affect. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* tapped into a generations-long process in which the child and the slave merged to create a powerful call on white adult sympathy. And as Stowe herself insisted in *A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin*, she drew from the words and experiences of enslaved people to create her moving set of fictions.

Traditionally, few have thought of proslavery writers as indebted to the actual experiences of enslaved people. We are still coming to terms with the tacit, subtle ways that enslaved people influenced those who needed to justify their treatment toward them. One way that we might trace their influence is to consider how the problems created by such a great number of orphaned children created cognitive and emotional challenges to white proslavery thinking, even as those same whites sought to justify the plight of the children they owned. The impact of millions of effectively orphaned children on the slaveholders who held them in bondage has been largely overlooked in the historiography. This omission reiterates the very ideas about childhood that this book seeks to undermine — that children are solely objects to be acted on, and largely incapable of influencing anyone else. At the very least, the practical concerns of keeping such children alive, and training them to endure slavery, demanded a particular attention to what children were and what sort of environment was conducive to them growing up in a way that would make life easiest for slaveholders.

A diary charting one man's journey as a ship's surgeon tending to slaves during the Middle Passage, 1749–1751, testifies to the difficulties at least some white slaveholders faced when confronted with the suffering of enslaved children. William Chancellor's encounter with sick and dying African children forces his initial thinking about Africans into a different metaphorical range. In the diary, Chancellor witnesses horrible scenes of children suffering, scenes that seem to cause him great mental distress. What he sees, his entries suggest, pushes him to embrace his role as caretaker of suffering children in order to lessen the "torture" occasioned by witnessing the fruits of a trade in which he is a willing participant. Although Chancellor is certainly no abolitionist, he does undergo a striking transformation in his own conceptual rhetoric as he shifts from observing adult Africans to caring for

very young children. As he moves through the cabin, removing the bodies of three- and four-year-old children, his insistence on the savagery of Africans slips. Instead, his close contact with the pain and death of young children forces a conceptual shift wherein Chancellor seems, rather unwillingly, drawn into a sympathetic role in which he occupies the position of a grieving parent.

To be clear, it would be a great misreading of the text to imagine that the tears of babes humanize Chancellor and occasion a change of heart. He ends the voyage as he begins it, as a supporter of the slave trade. What does change is the rhetoric Chancellor uses to justify his role in the slave trade. Living in a hold with dying children forces him into a new metaphorical range in his own thinking — he must find a new framework for understanding, and justifying, his own role in what unfolds before him. Chancellor, like many others, reaches for the image of a sympathetic, if helpless, caretaker of the suffering child.

Early in the voyage, Chancellor draws on the images of barbarity and savagery that marked much of the racist discourse about Africa. In 1750, he writes of his horror at such a "shocking part of the world, among Savages." He sees Africans as incredibly threatening, describing them as "merciless wretches" and "cannibals." "In the very looks of these people," he writes, "you may perceive something that is Merciless and vile, at the very sight of one of them this morning my blood grew cold." In short, he admits the alien place and people terrify him. And for Chancellor, a mark of that barbarity is the Africans' lack of feeling toward their offspring. In his desire to cast Africans in the most barbaric light possible, he opines that "they often eat their own children."[82]

Once he is on board with those enslaved — a large proportion of whom seem to be children — his demeanor changes toward the Africans around him. There is an outbreak of disease that takes a particularly hard toll on the youngest aboard. According to his narrative, at least two of the victims are three-year-old girls. He laments that because "[he] was ignorant that any children were to be purchased" his "medicines are very harsh for them."[83] In any case, the devastation wrought among the young passengers is horrifying: "This morning early going down among the Slaves, I found a boy dead, at noon, another, and in the afternoon, another. Oh, Reader, whoever thou art, it is impossible for you to conceive, or me to describe, the Torture I sustain at the loss of these Slaves we have committed to a watery grave,

one of wh[ic]h boys was to be my own."[84] Chancellor's own language here mixes sentiment and commerce in ways that would be further articulated by proslavery writers in the United States. The "torture" he sustains over the loss of slave children, one of which was to be "his own," seeks to layer a father's grief over a proprietor's. According to Chancellor's account, the suffering he witnesses makes him painfully aware of the "proper care" children require. For him, proper care is marked by the tears of an adult who grieves for pain he cannot alleviate. In an entry marked June 2, he again goes down to the hold to find "one of the boy slaves dead, whome we committed to a watry birth. I may truly say," Chancellor goes on, "unhappily for me, the uneasiness it has gave me has almost distracted me . . . to see 29 [children] come on board and hardly be able to crawl must be affecting to one who has the care of them."[85] Infantilization in this context has terrifying consequences as the prisoners, and particularly the small children, are reduced to the most fragile of all possible states — infants, unable to communicate, "hardly able to crawl," and at the mercy of forces they do not understand. On August 9, Chancellor laments that "my case is hard to see Young Creatures suffering in this manner." "[I]n short," he writes, "it renders my life a misery to me."[86]

Faced with still more deaths and worrying about the damage the smallpox would wreak if it got among the "little creatures" on board, Chancellor begins to articulate his own distress at the childhood suffering he witnesses through a prism that casts him as a would-be savior, the only one who knows what children are properly due: "It is [a] very affecting thing that I would have the Sole care of the Slaves, and know what is proper must see them suffer & even die."[87] By embracing himself as the sole caretaker, who alone knows what children need and deserve, Chancellor extricates himself from blame by drawing on his own sympathetic response to childhood suffering — a response ostensibly made possible by his own Western-cultivated knowledge and temperament. His privileged position comes into being through the repeated scenes of childhood suffering he witnesses — through the act of tending to enslaved children, he alone becomes able to give them what they need. Their suffering creates his role, and in turn, his response to that suffering is predicated on their need for him — a child's need for an adult's strength and knowledge.

The allure such a role holds for Chancellor is clear even after the voyage is over. Rather than viewing the slave trade itself as the cause of suffering,

he draws on his own self-fashioning as the savior of needy children to offer an early version of what would become a well-worn argument of paternal benevolence. Although he acknowledges that many find the slave trade "very vile," he insists that the trade is nothing more than "redeeming an unhappy people from inconceivable misery under which they continually labour, and from those miserys of life into which they are every day precipitated."[88] As Larry Tise has demonstrated, positive good arguments were relatively rare in the eighteenth century. Proslavery writers were more likely to cast the institution as a necessary evil. For Chancellor however, his own experiential lexicon of caretaker and child allows him to extend the benevolent parent metaphor to himself, and in the above passage, to white slaveholders across the globe.[89]

By the nineteenth century, many pro- and antislavery arguments hinged on the idea that slave children were suffering and needed a particular form of adult intervention — a formulation that defines children themselves as beings with particular needs. The main difference between pro- and antislavery arguments in this vein was not about whether slave children suffered. Rather, the point of contention was over who possessed the proper remedy for alleviating the ever-present threat to slave children. For white slavery apologists, childhood vulnerability still operated as a potent force, as it did in revolutionary accounts. However, in these stories, it is the slave owner who intervenes and saves the children from the pain and loss that otherwise would have been their lot. In a painfully ironic twist on the narrative of abused childhood that had justified revolutionary action, slave owners insisted that they often had to save black children from their own parents, who were cast as the primary abusers. By 1860, Chancellor Harper could confidently argue that slaves "are placed under the control of others, who are interested to restrain their excesses of cruelty or rage. Wives are protected from their husbands, and children from their parents."[90]

In short, the Revolution-era problem of unjust authority, when applied to slavery, was still framed in terms of bad parents and suffering children through the years leading to the Civil War. But the children in these scenarios did not suffer because their rights were not acknowledged. They suffered because caretakers did not attend to the needs particular to children — needs for love and patient, consistent nurture. The crime committed against these metaphorical and material children was not denying them their claim to eventual adulthood. Instead, the sin was improperly attending

to the affective demands of childhood, demands that were continually being defined through the careful monitoring of their violation.

Eugene Genovese has suggested that the structure of slavery itself actually reinforced a fictitious sense of the white plantation owners as indulgent antidotes to the overly harsh discipline of black parents.[91] For proslavery writers, when the system worked properly, slaves were able to occupy the happy position of a well-attended child, free both from undue discipline and from the crushing weight of adult choice. As permanent children, they are ensconced in an eternal present of dependence on the benevolent slave master — the radical potentiality of the revolutionary child is all but effaced. As James Kirke Paulding insists in 1817, slaves exist in a different temporal mode than whites, for they "enjoy, with a much keener zest than we, all those pleasures that spring from thoughtlessness of the past, and carelessness of the future."[92] Bryan Edwards argues that West Indian slaves' freedom from adult cares renders them far happier than European peasants who are tasked with feeding and clothing their own families. Their happiness comes largely from their ability to remain in a timeless present, without the worries about the past or future that plague European workers: "The European, by dint of labour, of numerous privations and of unremitting industry, has scarcely succeeded in acquiring a moment's ease, before a melancholy presage of the future intervenes and blasts his fugitive delights. He must think of his children who are growing up, and of old age which is fast approaching. . . . The negro too has his sufferings; I do not wish to deny it: but exonerated from the care of providing for his family hereafter, he suffers less."[93] Exempted from the troublesome adult task of thinking about his own future and that of his family, the slave can live the life of a child, eating, sleeping, and living wholly in the present.

Those who sought to render black children incapable of outgrowing their early vulnerability and dependence turned to the very philosophy that had first championed the child's weakness. Ironically, Lockean pedagogy, which had provided the philosophical foundation for the revolutionary child's ascension, also provided a loophole through which enslaved children could be denied the claim to futurity allotted to white children. Thomas Jefferson — a man intimately familiar with the impossibility of reconciling slavery with Revolutionary ideology — exploits the Lockean emphasis on habit to replace the inherent futurity of childhood (and by extension that of any subject metaphorically linked to childhood) with a form of perpetual

stasis. For Locke, as for many of the theorists who followed him, habit was the means of creating a pattern in the present that would be perpetuated in the future. Warning parents not to let their children grow too accustomed to glutting themselves on food or drink, Locke advises, "The great thing to be minded in education is, what habits you settle; and therefore in this, as all other things, do not begin to make any thing customary, the practice whereof you would not have continue and increase."[94] For Locke, habit forms a bridge from childhood to adulthood; it is a means of cementing uncivilized desires and mistakes in the fabric of the adult that child would become. An ingrained undesirable habit effectively stops time; the adult is trapped in the impressions formed in childhood, unable to surpass them and fully escape a state of nonage.

In a letter to Edward Bancroft in 1788, Jefferson uses the supposed permanence of habit to define slavery as a state that resists childhood's pull toward futurity. Dismissing the case for emancipation, Jefferson writes that, as far as he could judge "from the experiments which have been made, to give liberty to, or rather, to abandon persons whose habits have been formed in slavery is like abandoning children."[95] Habits — those seemingly permanent, or at least intractable, grooves created by early childhood — here create an important conceptual bridge between the state of a child and that of a slave, freezing the development of one in the experiences of the other. In order to disengage the slaves from the ideology of the revolutionary child, Jefferson sidesteps the futurity inherent in that conception of childhood to create a slave child enthralled to a permanent state of dependence. To make the metaphor work, the powerful attributes attached to the revolutionary child must be masked, and replaced, with associations of victimization and stasis. In 1812, Samuel Stanhope Smith also uses habit to mediate the relationship between slavery and a perpetual childhood. For him, blacks were permanently resigned to the state of slavery because they had been "accommodated to it from their infancy."[96] Of course, the "habits" of slavery Jefferson so blithely speaks of are represented in countless accounts as traumatic and painful experience — experience imposed on enslaved people by whites, who could then wring their hands over the after-effects.

By latching on to the child victim made painfully manifest in black experience and narrative, proslavery writers set into motion several trajectories, some of which went places they did not wish to go. Certainly, the metaphor worked to infantilize blacks and deny them claims to the dignity and rights

of adulthood. It is important to remember, however, that by investing in the black child victim, proslavery writers actually built on a foundation shared by black writers, and supported by both white and black abolitionists. Although the caricatured childlike African could not lay claim to citizenry, it inevitably laid claim to sympathy. In order to make the child a permanent victim, white writers also had to define the child as a subject who suffered mightily from the lack of loving care. The very mechanism that proslavery writers depended on to buttress their own position as paterfamilias of the "peculiar institution" also changed the terms of what white "fathers" owed their "children." The combined, if at times contradictory, effects of black writers who cataloged their own painful childhoods, white abolitionists who sought to cultivate the pathos within stories of childhood separation, and proslavery apologists who sought to establish themselves as both patriarch and savior, created a portrait of childhood as a state of permanent victimhood. In sum, reactions to, representations of, and justifications for slavery created an emotional and cognitive framework in which childhood suffering was extensively explored, and explicitly posited, as a need that adults had to address. In turn, the affective power invested in the slave child was a point of emotional leverage that allowed the horrors of slavery to impinge on the consciousness of thousands of people who benefited from the institution, yet found themselves having difficulty reconciling themselves to it.

Early Black Writers and the Problem of Childhood

Scholars and activists have painstakingly illustrated the malice underlying the infantilization of blackness and have worked to untether black identity from the childlike attributes that have been imposed on it by white writers. Yet the conceptions of *childhood* that were shaped in service of the child-slave metaphor have remained largely intact. As we work to disentangle concepts of African American identity from the infantilizing tropes of dependence and perpetual vulnerability, we would do well to remember that the child through whom those tropes were delivered also lost a good deal during the process. The continued equivalence of childhood, and particularly black childhood, with a state of perpetual victimhood needs to be rethought. Rather than simply dismissing the trope of the suffering black child as inherently disempowering, I seek to recover the resilience and creativity that black writers invested in their portraits of childhood. In much

of early black writing the authors actively cultivate traits and beliefs associated with their child-selves. In doing so, they transgress critical desires for an impossibly authentic and staunchly resistant African identity, free of the taint of complicity or accommodation. These texts teach us, through their attention to childhood, that the desire for an adult who can definitively leave childhood — with its dependence, vulnerability, and need for attachment — behind parallels the critical desire for a colonized subject who can somehow resist the pull of imposed culture. Both are fantasies that deny the authenticity and power of the interdependent subject.

Both Olaudah Equiano's and Venture Smith's narratives emphasize their suffering as children and insist on the injustice of that suffering. Their texts chart a course through heart-wrenching scenes of childhood separation to articulate a form of subjectivity that rejects the fantasy of a fully autonomous adult. They also reject the fairy tale of the black child who never makes it out of the woods. In white hands, the suffering slave child renders black identity a catastrophically static experience. The painful experiences of separation and abuse limit the victims to a perpetual present, doomed to repeat the "habits" of their past. But in the hands of writers like Equiano and Smith, the suffering child does not remain trapped in the moment of separation but, instead, facilitates the mutability and creativity of the authors. In lieu of the revolutionary child's improbable ability to break wholly from his legacy, or the slave child's inability to escape its heritage, the child figure articulated by early black writers emerges as one tributary to an identity that is itself in flux. The work of these writers creates a portrait of subjectivity that evokes what Alondra Nelson has called Afro-Futurism — a process of "defining oneself in light of ties to one's history and experience and being defined from without."[97] The child in these texts emerges as a site of history, both stolen and imposed, and as a place of intense creativity and reinvention.

Paul Youngquist has compared Equiano's pastiche of identities to the sampling aesthetic of a hip-hop artist. Tackling the question of whether Equiano's memory of an African childhood is authentic or fictionalized, Youngquist argues for an African-inspired aesthetic in which many texts, and many selves, are continually in play in a strategic deployment of creation. This aesthetic "involves playing with received materials in such a way as to wrest new possibilities from them by dislocating their component parts and redeploying them in new ways."[98] For both Equiano and Smith,

the experience of black childhood functions as one of these received materials, shaping the adult self in unanticipated ways. For both of these writers, the movement to adulthood is not an enactment of the future perfect in which the experiences of the past wholly determine the future. Because their identities and their adulthood are mobile positions, they are never forced to define their childhood selves either as determinative or as discarded. Rather, the suffering childhood they insist on representing emerges as one set of materials, among many, from which they can negotiate the demands of a system stacked against them. The suffering slave child emerges in black writing as a means for rerouting a fraught relationship with history, mourning its loss but also, in an adamant orientation toward the future, insisting on the possibilities that can emerge from that loss.[99]

Equiano's portrait of childhood separation from his family insists on the lasting impact of his childhood pain, but also insists that he is able to take on the challenges of adulthood. The vulnerable, sensitive child with great capacity for emotional attachment is not disavowed. Rather, it is through a child's ability to emulate those around him that Equiano is able to survive, and eventually succeed, in a hostile new culture. As he begins to learn English, Equiano makes it his business to study the ways of those around him. He had a strong desire, he tells us, "to resemble them, to imbibe their spirit, and to imitate their manners. I therefore embraced every occasion of improvement; and every new thing that I observed I treasured up in my memory."[100] For the slave, as for the child, the only way out is through; it is only by learning the ways of those in power that he can successfully move through a system designed to hold him in place.

If Equiano's canny negotiating skills are born of a child's need to cultivate those who have power over him, those skills also lead him to a place that allows him to reject the role of white savior, even as he continues to desire one for a good deal of the narrative. After all, his search is endlessly frustrated, illustrating that white saviors offer little hope for the literal and metaphorical black children whom they have orphaned. Pascal, Daniel Queen, the Guerin sisters, and the patrons who wish to send him to Africa all fail to supply the support or identity he craves. Yet while he learns the mendacity of white assurances, Equiano remains cannily aware that he still needs to solicit those assurances while finding ways to hold the promise makers accountable. In doing so, he creates a sophisticated and realistic template for adulthood that does not reject dependence, but rather creates a picture of interdependency

that allows the subject to operate in a complex matrix of shifting allegiances. Equiano's version of selfhood recognizes multiple avenues of oppression, and multiple possibilities for circumventing that oppression. It is a deeply complex and often uncomfortable portrait, to be sure. But it is also a pragmatic road map laying out a path to adulthood for individuals who did not inherit the claims to liberal citizenship awarded to white males of property (in other words, the majority of human beings in the Atlantic world).

Venture Smith's 1798 narrative also refuses either to inhabit the position of the suffering child (permanently mired in emotional pain) or to enact a black version of the revolutionary child (who can wholly reject the trappings of a tyrannical past). Unlike Equiano, Smith does not look for saviors among white masters or patrons. He does, however, embrace Western capitalism as a means of salvation. Indeed, his description of his own son's death can be shocking for modern readers who expect familial mourning to exist in a realm outside of the market's ledgers of loss and gain: "As soon as I heard of his [my son's] going to sea, I immediately set out to go and prevent it if possible. But on my arrival at Church's, to my great grief, I could only see the vessel my son was on almost out of sight going to sea. My son died of the scurvy on this voyage, and Church has never yet paid me the least of his wages. In my son, besides the loss of his life, I lost equal to seventy-five pounds."[101] The seemingly uncritical appropriation of the masters' habit of viewing black family members through a financial rather than an affective lens marks Venture Smith's narrative as tragically compromised for many critics. David Waldstreicher, for instance, writes that there "is something disturbing about Smith's absorption of the cash nexus in his society."[102] Philip Gould argues that when Smith tells us of his son's death by relating how much money he lost on the deal, "he commits the sin of slavery."[103] Such readings, however, gloss over a pivotal moment in Smith's childhood — a moment that initiates a process of self-composition that continues throughout Smith's life. Money, as seen through the eyes of the child Smith portrays, has an entirely different source of power — one that taps into an African past and provides a means for future success in Western terms.

Money becomes invested with particular, private meaning in the portion of *The Narrative* that unfolds in Africa, where the child-Smith watches his father die. And indeed, this passage is one of the few moments in which Smith allows for emotion at all:

> [M]y father was closely interrogated respecting his money which they knew he must have. But as he gave them no account of it, he was instantly cut and pounded on his body with great inhumanity, that he might be induced by the torture he suffered to make the discovery. All this availed not the least to make him give up his money, but he despised all the tortures which they inflicted, until the continued exercise and increase of torment, obliged him to sink and expire. He thus died without informing his enemies of the place where his money lay. I saw him while he was thus tortured to death. The shocking scene is to this day fresh in my mind, and I have often been overcome while thinking on it.[104]

When read against his own portrait of a painful childhood memory, Smith's engagement with money — instead of merely reiterating dehumanizing Western concepts — becomes a way of reclaiming what the child-Smith has lost. The scene of childhood separation, rather than rendering Smith trapped in a painful childlike present that he cannot transcend, provides him with material to remake himself in powerful ways. Rather than denying his history, Smith's ready access to it allows him to use that history to re-create himself.

When Smith buries money in the ground at another point of painful separation — after being sold away from his wife and child — the act has the ring of salvation to it. Unlike a lost family member, a buried treasure always carries the hope of rising again. Within the logic of the narrative, which fuses his father's memory with the memory of hidden money, the act itself evokes a connection with his lost father. And in the West African *minkisi* tradition, the act of burying something in the ground and then retrieving it promises the possibility of connection to one's dead ancestors. As MacGaffey, Guyer, and Belinga all suggest, tapping the ground with a staff was a meaning-laden gesture that, in African traditions, activated both the power of the fetishized object and, more important, the power of the ancestors who unfailingly were part of the object's power: "Consonant with the ancestral inspiration and relics of the dead that were key components of all *minkisi*, the [user's] privileged contact with the dead was the focal point of his powers. He aroused them by driving the point of his staff — duly strengthened by 'tokens' into the ground."[105] According to Smith's narrative, the gesture is potent indeed. After much negotiating, and several turns of luck, Smith winds up with a master who allows him to buy back his free-

dom. His first installment toward that freedom is the very money he buries, and then exhumes, from the ground.

In fact, the money Smith buries provides a useful prism for understanding the process through which many early black writers engaged their own painful childhoods. Certainly, Smith's horrified witness to his father's murder shapes how he encounters future hardship, but certainly not in the way proslavery writers would like to believe. Instead of being trapped in the moment of watching others torture his father to elicit the whereabouts of his treasure, Smith pulls from that memory to invest his own narrative with a new face of resistance and meaning. By burying money in the ground and then retrieving it, Smith remembers, reclaims, and reinvents the moment of childhood trauma occasioned by his father's hidden money. In many ways, the childhood selves of Equiano and Smith can be read as a similar sort of repository — both men can resurrect the experiences they have had in order to reinvent their adult selves.

Returning to the writers who initially invested the scene of the suffering slave child with an undeniable emotional power — a power often appropriated by white writers — reveals that the trope of the suffering black child is a far more complex semiological system than has been previously acknowledged. In one respect, the suffering child's emergence in the slavery debate, and in much American literature that postdates that debate, reveals a compelling — if largely unrecognized — cultural legacy of African American experience. On another level, the use of the child by African American writers has much to teach us about how we might retrieve childhood as a site of potential rather than of victimhood. By acknowledging early black writers as the creators of this powerful legacy, we can begin to reclaim their insistence on viewing the child's pain as important, and deserving of redress. Their view of adulthood, in turn, provides a canny means of rethinking the host of binaries separating not just white from black, and adult from child, but also the notions of dependence and autonomy, power and subjection, that have been attached to those binaries. Smith and Equiano, among others, create a subject who proves that strength and resilience are not the opposite of dependency and vulnerability. They are, instead, two sites of an ever-shifting continuum on which all humans reside.

EPILOGUE

The Materials and Metaphors of Schoolwork

SUFFERING CHILDHOOD IN EARLY AMERICA has focused on the new meanings that emerge from early American encounters with the suffering child — both material and metaphorical. Throughout this study, I have argued that placing the child at the foreground of literary and cultural analysis forces us to confront the space in between — the space between the literal and the figurative, between the symbol and the person whose experience was marked by having that symbol imposed on him or her. Having traced some of the complex adult investments in the child in discourses about women, Indians, and African Americans, I end this study with a brief meditation on the lives of children who were explicitly asked to inhabit these cultural tropes. More specifically, I propose some ways of engaging early American children's voices where they are often found — in school records. The often formulaic exercises children perform as part of education can be an important resource for examining national investments in particular ideas about childhood, and how actual children absorbed, resisted, and reworked the symbolism they were asked to inhabit. Karen Sánchez-Eppler has written that "childhood may prove one of the most lucid places for understanding the relation between individual identity and cultural discourses."[1] School records may well prove one of the richest resources for tracking how that relationship between individual and culture works and how we might compare its functions across ethnic, geographic, and chronological boundaries. Adult responses to minority schools, when placed in conversation with the students' presence in the school records themselves, can provide a provocative

portrait of how the discourses of infantilization, education, and citizenship shaped one another, and shaped the lives of those raised within the boundaries of those discourses. More precisely, early nineteenth-century school records can allow us to better understand how attitudes toward both African Americans and Native Americans were forged through educational theory and practice. As Alisse Portnoy has pointed out, while African Americans and American Indians cannot be considered as an aggregate, neither does it make sense to separate them, as much scholarship of the 1820s and 1830s has done.[2] School records are one bridge across this methodological gap.

Education in the late eighteenth century and nineteenth century (and one might argue, in the twenty-first) was most often considered a one-sided endeavor in which all-powerful instructors shape the malleable and receptive minds of children unable to resist the power of adult influence. The idealized relationship between Rousseau and his pupil Émile (1762), in which properly planned lessons result in a perfectly formed young citizen, had libratory potential for children who would have been excluded by notions of divinely ordained hierarchy. This all-encompassing notion of education, however, also rendered Rousseau's tutor a nearly godlike figure, capable of molding his young pupil into any shape he chose. Considering the imaginative power invested in the educator, it's no surprise that education has been central to so many colonizing endeavors. Indeed, the religious section of many nineteenth-century American newspapers cataloged the educational successes of mission schools across the globe. By casting a glance over a single newspaper page, one could learn the latest news about the educating and proselytizing missions in the American Barbados, as well as Berbice, Calcutta, and Canton.[3] As Ann Laura Stoler has argued, childrearing and education are not the "microcosms of empire, but its marrow."[4]

In the early decades of the nineteenth century, Enlightenment notions of a child's malleability had become a means, at least for some, of determining whether nonwhite occupants of U.S. soil could become incorporated within national borders or whether they would have to be excised from a nation that often figured itself as a youth, replete with growing pains. As I discuss in chapter 2, national policy on Indian removal often touched on the question of whether Indians could behave as good children, good students, and good dependents or whether their independent nature would lead them to resist the "civilizing" effects of education. The questions of what to do with

Indians and with slaves were interlocked in the era's moral arguments and were inextricably linked in the increasingly contentious question of states' rights. As James Madison wrote in 1826, "[n]ext to the case of the black race within our bosom, that of the red on our borders is the problem most baffling to our country."[5]

Even as both concerns dealt with how to incorporate or exclude nonwhites in the American nation, the responses many whites had to the proposals of Indian removal and African colonization were starkly different. In fact, most of the people who were antiremoval were *pro*colonization. This inconsistency did not go unnoted. A speaker at an 1831 meeting of African Americans railed against "the anti-Christian and inconsistent conduct of those who so strenuously advocate our removal from our native country to the burning shores of Liberia and who with the same breath contend against the cruelty and injustice of Georgia in her attempt to remove the Cherokee west of the Mississippi."[6] Alisse Portnoy argues that this contradiction occurred, among other reasons, because of a failure in imagination. In legal treatises and in much of the public print culture of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, American Indians had been figured as a proud and independent people, sovereign over their own lands. In the 1810s and 1820s, Portnoy contends, there was no imaginative framework in which white Americans could visualize freed black people operating autonomously. As my discussion in chapter 2 illustrates, the idea of the staunchly independent Indian stoic was a touchstone in literary, legal, and ethnographic texts. In contrast, as chapter 4 discusses, enslaved people were often figured as children incapable of caring for themselves. The widely divergent public response to the idea of banishing Indians or African Americans was one product of the different public portraits of these populations — portraits that were often forged through the figure of the vulnerable and suffering child.

The New-York African Free School (NYAFS) was a project designed to allow New Yorkers to see black children as potentially independent citizens. As I argued in the previous chapter, a Lockean investment in childhood potential was a double-edged sword in the debate over slavery. Against the backdrop of Revolutionary rhetoric, writers ranging from Thomas Jefferson to the lawmakers of New York State culled these very theories about early childhood to argue against immediate emancipation. The common proslavery argument that slaves were hopelessly trapped in bad habits picked

up in childhood made the impressionability of children a liability rather than a claim to future equality. Early habits — the brutal lessons of slavery taught largely by white men — allegedly warped slave children so completely that they were trapped in the tyranny of early influences. The manumission law of 1799 itself contains elements of both the revolutionary child and the suffering slave child. Because the law freed infants born in 1799 first, it implicitly suggested that it was necessary for newborns to be raised with the expectation of freedom. (Of course, on a more pragmatic level, the gradual manumission law also deferred the cost of manumission for several years.) The language of childhood figures prominently throughout the statute.[7] In a six-paragraph document, two long paragraphs are devoted to the problem of "abandoned" infants: "And it shall be further enacted, That the person entitled to such service may nevertheless, within one year after the birth of such a child, elect to abandon his or her right to such service . . . in which case every child abandoned as foresaid shall be considered as paupers of the respective town or city where the proprietor or owner of the mother of any such child may reside."[8] This legal construction depends on the inherent, and seemingly perpetual, dependence of black children. The law's stress on the problem of "abandoned children" (tellingly, abandoned by their owners, not by their mothers) conflates potentially emancipated slaves with uncared-for children, rendering both equally helpless and dependent on the care of the state, and on the white adults who were inseparable from that state.

So the stakes were high at the African Free School, and the students surely knew it. Their success — or lack of it — was key testimony about whether black people could access the realm of adult reason and thereby move into independence. Student work was showcased in public performances attended by the public and the press, and their performances were topics followed with considerable interest in the public sphere. In the 1820s and 1830s, the school became a rhetorical battleground in a city at the center of some strident debates over the merits of the American Colonization Society. The NYAFS students were key players in a debate over whether black people could ever achieve the self-sufficiency that would permit them to remain in the United States as freedpeople or whether their imagined childishness would require exile to Africa. And of course, the question was not solely one for whites to answer. The African American community would long struggle over whether black people could or should align them-

selves as Africans, with their allegiance toward a form of black nationalism leaning toward Africa, Haiti, and other points of emigration, or whether they should fully commit to an American identity, with the concomitant investment in moral uplift and the white middle-class values that uplift would emulate.[9] It's a conversation that would not end with the Civil War or even with emancipation, and it's a conversation in which both the students and parents of the NYAFS took part.

Until recently, many scholars have tended to gloss over the American Colonization Society as a laughably misguided endeavor.[10] But in the 1820s — the era during which school records were scrupulously kept, and the era in which New York's black population came into legal freedom — the American Colonization Society was comprised of, in the words of one African American writer, "all the best people."[11] Those people included Senator Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Francis Scott Key, and others. William Lloyd Garrison, Arthur Tappan, and others were, at least at first, in favor of colonization. One means of understanding the sharp turn in the fortunes of the ACS (at least in reformer circles) is to consider the colonization debates that occurred through and around the idea of the educated slave that operated in tandem with the question of Indian education. In spite of the school's Enlightenment roots, by the 1820s many of the school's funders in the New York Manumission Society had become invested in the idea of African colonization, which rested on the argument that African Americans were trapped — by prejudice, if not by inherent deficiencies — in a life of perpetual childlike dependence in the United States. At least one lesson performed at the school's yearly "examination days" positioned the student speaker as a *tableau vivant* displaying the need for the ACS's benevolent intervention. James Fields's 1819 valedictory address explicitly contrasts the Lockean ideals of childhood potential with a vision of the perpetually dependent child. In this paradigm, the Enlightenment stress on futurity cannot rescue the permanently degraded black child. According to the records, this speech was spoken by the fourteen-year-old Fields, but written by Rueben Leggett, a white school trustee. Fields begins with a traditional gesture of gratitude and pride. His tone then changes, as he asks for the audience's sympathy. In this instance, however, it is not the imagined peril of slavery that poses the problem but rather the everyday experience of prejudice and attendant poverty that faced young black graduates who had difficulty finding work:

> But I crave your sympathy for myself and for my School mates, for I feel that we need it. Had I the mind of a *Lock[e]* and the eloquence of a Chatham, Still would there not be in the minds of some an immense distance that would divide me from one of a White Skin — What signifies it? Why should I strive hard, and acquire all the constituents of man, If the prevailing genius of the land admits as such, but in an inferior degree, — Pardon me if I feel insignificant and weak — Pardon me if I feel discouragement to oppress me to the very earth. Am I arrived at the end of my education? Just upon the event of setting out in the world? Of commencing some honest pursuit by which to earn a comfortable subsistence? What are my prospects? And to what turn my hand? Will I be a mechanic? No one will employ me, White boys won't work with me — will I be a merchant? No one will have me in his office — white clerks won't associate with me — Drudgery and servitude then are my prospects — can you be surprised at my discouragement?[12]

This is a startling valedictory address — given most likely to an audience of benefactors who would want to see evidence that their generosity was paying off. Perhaps, we might imagine, the author of this piece, Rueben Leggett, had spoken with Fields and had lent the student's frustrations voice as he penned the speech for him to give. Yet this lament closely echoes much of the rhetoric of the American Colonization Society, which often cited the intractable cruelties of prejudice as the reason why freedpeople would not be able to flourish within the boundaries of the United States. Several members of the New York Manumission Society, as well as the NYAFS schoolmaster, Charles C. Andrews, were supporters of the ACS. Hiram Ketchum, the author of another of Fields's speeches, in which he refers to the students as the "degraded descendents" of "despised parents," was a board member on the newly formed Committee for the "Emigration of Persons of Colour to the Republic of Hayti" — an offshoot of the New York ACS. In the correspondence that led to the creation of that committee, a series of 1824 letters between Loring Dewey and the then-president of Haiti, President Boyer, laments how his "brethren . . . groan in the United States of America under the yoke of prejudice" and offers Haiti as an option for African Americans who, the argument runs, and as Fields's speech testifies, would never be able to find peace or prosperity within the boundaries of the United States. Haiti was certainly a subject of study at the school — a series of questions

and answers about the new nation are featured in school documents and were likely performed for an audience.[13]

Speeches like this one reveal that school children like Fields were indeed public players in national conversations about race and citizenship. As a child standing on stage, Fields undoubtedly gave a human face to the pervasive prejudice that ordered New York society. He also, perhaps, acted as a poster boy for a cause he might well have found objectionable. While acknowledging the difficulty of definitively reading the possible tension between the white scriptwriter and the black child who performed the words of that script, to ignore the possibility of that tension, or to deny the worth of exploring it, is to deny James Fields the possibility of agency. The events that occurred in the years after Fields's valedictory provide considerable evidence of the cognitive dissonance Fields may have felt — and must have worked through — as he performed his scholarly role. In 1834, sixteen years after he gave a white-authored speech that declared that prejudice would keep him from succeeding in the United States, James Fields would preside as Secretary at the Fourth Annual Convention of the Free People of Color of the United States. As secretary he may well have taken notes at the speech of his fellow member of the board William Hamilton. The minutes of that meeting indicate that if Fields had ever believed the script he was handed for his valedictory speech, the impression was far from permanent. The records of the meeting reveal the group's ardent opposition to the American Colonization Society. The records also reveal a canny awareness of the narratives the ACS deployed to make its case — among them the story of a people who will only be "a drawback on the resources of society." "As long at least as the Colonization Society exists," the records read, "a convention of colored people be highly necessary. . . . That society has spread itself over this whole land, it is artful, it suits itself to all places. It is one thing at the south, and another at the north; it blows hot and cold; it sends forth bitter and sweet; it sometimes represents us as the most corrupt, vicious and abandoned of any class of men in the community. Then again we are kind, meek and gentle. Here we are ignorant, idle, a nuisance, and a drawback on the resources of the country. But as abandoned as we are, in Africa we shall civilize and Christianize all that heathen country."[14] And indeed, much of the African American generation in New York that grew up in the years following Fields's speech opposed colonization. In fact, the issue of colonization

would nearly end the school's tenure altogether. As alumni James McCune Smith would write, and the records of the manumission society confirm, it was the "decided colonizationist views of the teacher, Charles C. Andrews," that caused "his removal in 1833."[15] Thus the school was the site of an early, well-organized act of black community resistance. We miss a good deal of the work of African American community building and self-representation in antebellum New York City society if we don't consider this school — and others like it — as a place where both black children and adults engaged in the important work of cultural resistance and representation.

The framework of encounter that marks Fields's deeply ambivalent speech about prejudice amid colonization debates can also be brought to seemingly neutral drawing and copying exercises found in the records. These materials document the push-and-pull between adult tropes and children's experiences. In her analysis of what she found the unfair insistence on authenticity demanded of twentieth-century Indians who wished to gain tribal status, Laura Donaldson looks for moments of what she calls "entanglement" that allow for the complex interactions between instructor and student in colonizing situations. In one instance, a Mi'kmaw woman remade the rosary into an object that reflected her own belief system, insisting that it was also a "cure for diseases and protection from enemies."[16] I suggest that school records are a rich but largely underutilized resource for charting this uneven back-and-forth between powerful "instructors" and their resourceful students. Looking at school records as places of encounter demands a rethinking of many well-worn critical strategies — among them the insistence on authenticity and autonomy that Stevens finds unrealistic. It is within such a framework that the drawing and copying exercises the students performed can emerge as case studies in how the white and black cultures engaged one another in early nineteenth-century New York.

The image of the hunter and his dogs (see figure 4), for instance, was a standard scene for European artists enamored with romanticizing country life. Black students who learned to copy the image would have been performing the same work that white students were doing. However, the image takes on a different set of meanings when we remember that students such as Henry Highland Garnet, with his family, had run away from slavery. For a student like the young Garnet, who went on to become a radical abolitionist, the picture of a white man with dogs on a hunt was more likely to elicit nightmarish associations with the slave-catcher than the idyllic image

Figure 4. *Hunter with Dogs*. (Collection of the New-York Historical Society, neg. no. 78742.15)

of pastoral leisure that whites would likely feel the piece conveyed. Like the Indian woman who altered the meanings of the found rosary even as she made it her own, African Free School students, and others like them, had to find places within their own experience to make room for the objects of Anglophone education.

Similarly, the portrait of Napoleon-Francois-Charles-Joseph Bonaparte (see figure 5) takes on new layers of significance when executed by New York African Free School student James McCune Smith. As the son of Napoleon Bonaparte, Charles Joseph was caught up in the political turmoil of his father's life, exiled to Vienna at the age of four, and encouraged to forget all ties to France. It is provocative to consider how young black students, who may well have had their own family histories stolen from them through slavery, might have felt about this young, dispossessed prince, exiled far from his native land. For them, Napoleon-Francois-Charles-Joseph would likely have resonated in strikingly different ways than for white students for whom independence from family could more easily be construed as an opportunity than as a tragedy.

These examples are only a few of many specimens preserved in the archives — the schoolmaster's careful record keeping, as well as the consider-

Figure 5. *Napoleon Francois Charles Joseph*, BV African Free School, volume 4, page 31, by James M. Smith. (Collection of the New-York Historical Society, negative no. 77698d)

able public interest in the school, ensured the preservation of a good deal of student work, often in more than one venue. Indeed, the students' work was often reproduced in the public sphere in New York and beyond. The editors of *Freedom's Journal*, the first black newspaper, seemed to agree that the accomplishments of the students were part of the public domain. On October 3, 1828, the paper ran the following notice:

> The Teacher of the African Free School, in Mulberry st., received, yesterday, an anonymous letter from some old acquaintance, advising the "trial of skill" of some of the pupils in the school, on two "puzzling arithmetical questions." The writer of the letter is hereby respectfully informed that they were solved in a few minutes by a little fellow twelve years of age, and if favoured with a call, the work shall be performed in his presence by the same boy. — A[17]

And the students' accomplishments were not just fodder for the emerging black press. Several newspapers covered the student performances, including the *American Monthly Magazine and Critical Review* and *The Commercial Advertiser*.[18]

The public attention to the NYAFS was at least partially generated by the connections of the school's benefactors. But public scrutiny and interpreta-

tion of student work were by no means unique to the NYAFS. Indeed, public responses to minority student work provide an important comparative framework for reform efforts throughout antebellum America. Newspapers in the 1820s and 1830s regularly published accounts of the progress in Indian missions. As with the accounts detailing student work at the New York African Free School, writing about mission schools figured students who succeeded in their education as a counterargument to exclusion or exile. "What account will our people render to God," one writer asked in 1829, "if through their neglect, [the Choctaw] people should be forced into the boundless wilds beyond the Mississippi, in their present state of ignorance? They are now accessible by us; they are now hungry for the gospel." If time is wasted, the writer warns, the "precious nation" of the Choctaws, rather than "being turned" to a civilized state acceptable to Americans, would "in a few generation be exterminated" by being "thrown together in the western wilderness."[19] In 1830, Colonel Gold's account of life among the Cherokees seemed almost a direct response to the 1818 House Committee report's stark choice for the future of the Indians: "These sons of the forest should be moralized or exterminated."[20] If Americans wanted to avoid the latter, the committee reported, they need only "[p]ut into the hands of their children the primer and the hose, and they will naturally, in time, take hold of the plough." Gold's newspaper account argues that this is precisely what happened. Describing his time among the Cherokees, Gold writes admiringly of their affluence and the Christian education the children receive. In sum, there was "strong evidence" that Indians could be educated into American society: "the wandering Indian has been converted to the industrious husbandman; and the tomahawk and rifle are exchanged for the plough, the hoe, the wheel and the loom." In sum, Cherokees were "attaining a degree of civilization that was entirely unexpected, from the natural disposition of these children of the forest."[21] Notably, in Gold's account, as in missionary promotions, there was nearly equal emphasis on Indian adults as on children. Not only were the children being Christianized, the wandering brave was now an industrious "husbandman." Such accounts work against the ideal of the impossibly stoic Indian adult I discuss in chapter 2, figured as so fiercely independent that he could never place himself in the role of a student dependent on instructors and ministers.

The work of minority students in early America — subjects doubly infantilized by their age and their ethnicity — can provide a means of think-

ing through how representations of race and definitions of childhood were experienced, and perhaps even shaped, by actual children. Examining the educational agendas of both African and Indian schools can be a valuable method for exploring how representations of blacks and Indians shaped each other and contributed to an imagined white citizen-subject whose identity was defined in a continued dance of mutual definition against both populations. Finally, I suggest the African Free School records, along with those of Indian schools, schools for the disabled, and schools for the poor, may well provide an archival rebuttal to a colonizing model of education, in which children can be easily molded to take their place within narratives adults create for them. Rather, the methodological difficulties these materials present can push us past the unproductive yet remarkably long-lived model that posits children — like the infantilized peoples to whom they were often compared — as subjects whose wills and identities can be subsumed by "adults" who alone occupy a world of uncompromised authenticity.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (New York: Penguin, 1986), 327.

2. Ibid., 326.

3. It is a critical commonplace that Uncle Tom is infantilized in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. A brief sampling of the work that touches on this theme includes Sarah N. Roth, "The Mind of a Child: Images of African Americans in Early Juvenile Fiction," *Journal of the Early Republic* 25, no. 1 (2005): 79–109; Richard Yarborough, "Strategies of Black Characterization in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the Early Afro-American Novel," in *New Essays on "Uncle Tom's Cabin,"* ed. Eric Sundquist (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 45–84. James Baldwin's 1949 essay remains one of the best known on Stowe's infantilizing portrait of Uncle Tom. James Baldwin, "Everybody's Protest Novel," in *Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin": a Casebook*, ed. Elizabeth Ammons (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 49–56.

4. See Lee Edelman, *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); Jane Thrailkill, "Traumatic Realism and the Wounded Child," in *The American Child: A Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Caroline F. Levander and Carol J. Singley (Camden: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 128–48; Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (London: Papermac, 1996).

5. Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 3.

6. As Cindy Weinstein points out in her excellent study of sentimentalism, much of American literature in the nineteenth century involves children coming to terms with the great pain of parental loss. Cindy Weinstein, *Family, Kinship, and Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

7. Russ Castronovo, *Fathering the Nation: American Genealogies of Slavery and Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Jay Fliegelman, *Prodigals to Pilgrims: The American Revolution against Patriarchal Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Caroline Levander, *Cradle of Liberty: Race, the Child and National Belonging from Thomas Jefferson to W. E. B. Du Bois* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

8. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Memorial Edition, ed. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh, 20 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1903–04), 19:41.

9. Rev. John Hale, *A Modest Enquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft* (1702), in

Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648–1706, ed. George Lincoln Burr (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1914), 413.

10. Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2007); Gillian Brown, *The Consent of the Governed: The Lockean Legacy in Early American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, 2nd ed., ed. Crawford Brough Macpherson (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1980), sec. 55, p. 31.

11. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Self-Reliance," in *Self-Reliance and Other Essays* (New York: Courier Dover, 1993), 20.

12. Holly Brewer's recent work on legal documentation and practice has described how Locke's emphasis on consent explicitly excluded children "from equality in Revolutionary reforms and the ideology underpinning them." Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*, 4.

13. Levander, *Cradle of Liberty*, 1.

14. Lennard Davis, "The End of Identity Politics and the Beginning of Dismodernism: On Disability as an Unstable Category," in *Bending Over Backwards: Disability, Dismodernism, and other Difficult Positions* (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 30–31.

15. Karen Sánchez-Eppler's *Dependent States* is a key critical text on this question and has greatly influenced my own thinking about dependence and Americans' reaction to it. Karen Sánchez-Eppler, *Dependent States: The Child's Role in Nineteenth-Century American Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

16. A brief sampling of the criticism that has struggled with the question of authenticity in early American literature: Gordon Sayre, "Defying Assimilation, Confounding Authenticity: The Case of William Apess," *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies* 11, no. 1 (1996): 1–19; G. Michelle Collins-Sibley, "Who Can Speak? Authority and Authenticity in Olaudah Equiano and Phillis Wheatley," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 5, no. 3 (2004); Lorrayne Carroll, *Rhetorical Drag: Gender Impersonation, Captivity, and the Writing of History* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2007).

17. Ann Laura Stoler, "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies," in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 23–70.

18. Sánchez-Eppler, *Dependent States*, xvi.

19. Karen Calvert, *Children in the House: The Material Culture of Early Childhood, 1600–1900* (Boston: Northeastern, 1994); Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*; James Marten, *The Children's Civil War* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1998); Gary Cross, *Kids'*

Stuff: Toys and the Changing World of American Childhood (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

20. Courtney A. Weilke-Mills, "'Learn to Love your Book': The Child Reader and Affectionate Citizenship," *Early American Literature* 43, no. 1 (2008): 35–61; Patricia Crain, *The Story of A: The Alphabetization of America from "The New England Primer" to "The Scarlet Letter"* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000).

21. Sánchez-Eppler, *Dependent States*.

22. Paula Fass, "Social History and the History of Childhood," *SHCY Newsletter* 13 (2009): 16.

23. George Lakoff and Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), xi.

24. Patrick Hogan, *Cognitive Science, Literature and the Arts: A Guide for Humanists* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 87.

25. See Andrew Ortony, "Metaphor, Language and Thought," in *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Hogan, *Cognitive Science*, 88.

26. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove Press, 1967), 31.

27. Mark Turner, *The Literary Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 60.

28. Giles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic, 2003).

29. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), ix.

30. Joshua Bellin, *The Demon of the Continent: Indians and the Shaping of American Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 4.

31. Howard Gardner, *Art, Mind and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 163; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*.

32. John Smith, "A Description of New England," 1616, in *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, from the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776*, coll. Peter Force (New York: Peter Smith, 1947), 2:22.

33. See Jay Fliegelman, *Prodigals to Pilgrims*; Joyce Appleby, *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Boston: Belknap Press, 2001).

34. John Eliot, *The Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians* (1647; repr., New York: Sabin's Reprints, 1854); Edward Watts and Malini Schueller, eds., *Messy Beginnings: Postcoloniality and Early American Studies* (Piscaway: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 9.

35. Increase Mather, *An Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New England*, in *Departing*

Glory: Eight Jeremiads by Increase Mather, introduction by Lee Schweninger (Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1987), 16.

36. David Eltis, "The Fate, Identities, and Significance of Africans Liberated from the Transatlantic Slave Trade: An Overview" (paper given at Yale University, October 23, 2008). Not all these slaves wound up in the United States. However, the huge proportion of children leaving Africa sheds light on just how many Africans experienced the slave trade as children.

37. Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 47.

CHAPTER ONE. Children in the Hands of Satan

1. Henry Spellman, "Relation of Virgnea," 1613, in *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. Edward Arber and A. G. Bradley (Edinburgh, 1910), cii.

2. Ibid.

3. Walter Raleigh, *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana* (1596; repr., New York: Da Capo Press, 1968), 80.

4. Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 37.

5. For example, Helen Rountree suggests that the Powhatan Indians used only subtle pressure to modify their children's behavior, in striking contrast to the patriarchal model employed by the English. Helen C. Rountree, ed., *Powhatan Foreign Relations, 1500–1722* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 174.

6. Susan Myra Kingsbury, comp., *Records of the Virginia Company of London* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1906), 1:256.

7. John Smith, "A Description of New England," in *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, from the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776*, coll. Peter Force (New York: Peter Smith, 1947), 2:22.

8. Anonymous, *New England's First Fruits* (1643; repr., New York: Sabin's Reprints, 1854), 42.

9. William Wood, *New England's Prospect* (1634; repr., New York: Da Capo Press, 1968), 80.

10. Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan: Or New Canaan, containing an abstract of New England. — Composed in three Bookes*, in *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America, from the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776*, coll. Peter Force (New York: Peter Smith, 1836), 2:82.

11. Anonymous, *New England's First Fruits*, 37.

12. Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics*, 30.

13. John Smith, *A True Relation*, in *Complete Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. Philip Barbour (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 32.

14. Ibid., 258.

15. Ibid., 259.

16. Ralph Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present State of Virginia, and the Sucesse of the Affairs there until the 18th of June 1614* (Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1957), 258.

17. Ibid., 4.

18. John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia*, in *Complete Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. Philip Barbour (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 1:14.

19. Hamor, *True Discourse*, 6.

20. Ibid.

21. John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles*, 1624, in *Jamestown Narratives*, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Champlain, Va.: Roundhouse, 1998), 259.

22. Hamor, *True Discourse*, 11.

23. Ibid., 41–42.

24. Ibid., 42.

25. John Rolfe, "Coppie of the Gentle-mans letters to Sir Thomas Dale, that after married Powhatan's daughter, containing the reasons moving him thereunto," in John Smith, *Generall Historie*, 61.

26. John Smith, *Generall Historie*, ed. Haile, 258.

27. Ibid., 259–60.

28. Ibid., 259.

29. For a discussion of how the English viewed Pocahontas's cultural transformation, see Karen Robertson, "Pocahontas at the Masque," *Signs* 21, no. 31 (1996): 551–83.

30. Kingsbury, *Records*, 2:257.

31. Rountree, *Powhatan Foreign Relations*, 197.

32. Kingsbury, *Records*, 1:311.

33. Robert S. Tilton, *Pocahontas: The Evolution of an American Narrative* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

34. John Smith, *Generall Historie*, ed. Haile, 261.

35. John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity," in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, 4th ed., ed. Nina Baym et. al. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1994), 1:175.

36. Ibid., 176.

37. Gillian Whitlock, "Outlaws of the Text: Women's Bodies and the Organisation of Imperial Space," in *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (New York: Routledge, 1995), 352.

38. Michael Warner, "What's Colonial about Colonial America?" in *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 54.

39. Lola Lemire Tostevin, "Contamination: A Relation of Difference," *Tessera* 6 (Spring 1989): 13.

40. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), 6.

41. Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and other Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 7.

42. John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *A Godlye Form of Household Government, for the ordering of private families according to the direction of God's word* (London: Assignes of Thomas Man, 1630), b2.

43. For more on the effect of the New England climate on the colonists' beliefs about themselves and their mission in America, see Karen Ordahl Kupperman, "Climate and Mastery of the Wilderness in Seventeenth-Century New England," in *Seventeenth Century New England: A Conference Held by the Colonial Society of Massachusetts June 18 and 19, 1982* (Boston: University Press of Virginia, 1984); and John Canup, *Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1990).

44. John Eliot, *The Day-Breaking*, 20.

45. *Ibid*., 9.

46. Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan*, 35.

47. Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 89.

48. Ibid., 114.

49. John Winthrop, *The Journal of John Winthrop 1630–1649*, abr. ed., ed. Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1996), 54.

50. Ibid., 63.

51. Ibid., 136.

52. Ibid., 140.

53. Ibid., 141.

54. Ibid., 194.

55. John Robinson, "Of Children and Their Education," in *The Works of John Robinson*, ed. Robert Ashton (London, 1851), 1:246.

56. Ibid.

57. See James Axtell, *The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); James Axtell, *The European*

and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); and Margaret Connell Szasz, *Indian Education in the American Colonies, 1607–1783* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988).

58. Karen Ordhal Kupperman draws from William Wood, Roger Williams, and Christopher Levett among others to support this assertion. Karen O. Kupperman, *Indians And English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 153.

59. Pierre de Charlevoix, *Journal of a Voyage to North-America*, 2 vols., quoted in James Axtell, *Indian Peoples of Eastern America: A Documentary History of the Sexes* (New York: Oxford, 1981), 15–16.

60. Ann Bradstreet, "In Memory of My Dear Grandchild — Elizabeth Bradstreet, Who Deceased August, 1665, Being a Year and a Half Old," in *The Works of Anne Bradstreet*, ed. Jeannine Hensley and Adrienne Rich (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 235.

61. Bradstreet's "On the Burning of My House" is often noted for its depiction of the pull toward grief in spite of the need for acceptance.

62. William Wood, *New England's Prospect*, 93.

63. Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*, ed. John J. Teunissen and Evelyn J. Hinz (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973), 116.

64. Robinson,"Of Children," 249.

65. Dod and Cleaver, *Godlye Form*, 74.

66. Williams, *Key into the Language*, 116.

67. Ibid.

68. Anonymous, *New England's First Fruits*, 12–13.

69. Eliot, *Day-Breaking*, 11.

70. Linda Pollack, *The Forgotten Children* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 150.

71. See John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America* (New York: Random House, 1994) and James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1975): 55–88.

72. Increase Mather, "An Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New England," 16.

73. Cotton Mather, "A Family Well-Ordered, or, An Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in One Another" (Boston: Printed by B. Green & J. Allen, for Michael Perry & Benjamin Eliot, 1699), 7.

74. Ibid., 8.

75. For two excellent treatments on the role of woman-as-captive see Michelle Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682–1861* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997); and Christopher Castiglia,

Bound and Determined: Captivity Culture Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996).

76. Thomas Hooker, *The Application of Redemption, by the Effectual Work of the Word and Spirit of Christ, for the Bringing Home of Lost Sinners to God* (1657; repr., New York: Arno Press, 1972), 268.

77. Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, in *Women's Captivity Narratives*, ed. Katherine Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 45–48.

78. The most accessible version of this text is found in Vaughan and Clark's collection of captivity narratives. Cotton Mather "The Condition of the Captives," in *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724*, ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 143.

79. Ibid.

80. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 88.

81. Cotton Mather, "New Assaults from the Indians," in *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724*, ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 140. As with many depictions of atrocities, it is nearly impossible to verify the historical accuracy of this account. Certainly violence was a part of the captivity experience, but it is just as certain that Puritan narrators often overlooked Indian kindnesses and exaggerated their acts of aggression. My purpose here is not to question the historicity of this event, but to examine its *rhetorical* function. Whether or not this scene actually happened as it is depicted, Mather chose to depict the account as we now find it. I want to explore the implications of that decision.

82. Ibid.

83. On the in-fighting that plagued Salem see Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974). On the possibility of ergot poisoning, see Mary K. Matossian, *Poisons of the Past: Molds, Epidemics and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 113–22.

84. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 191–92.

85. Deodat Lawson, *A Brief and True Narrative of Witchcraft at Salem Village*, 1692, in *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648–1706*, ed. George Lincoln Burr (New York, 1914).

86. Salem Witchcraft Papers, vol. 2, Examination of Sarah Good, http://etext.virginia.edu/salem/witchcraft/texts/BoysSal2.html.

87. Salem Witchcraft Papers, vol. 1, Examination of Martha Corey, http://etext.virginia.edu/salem/witchcraft/. Hereafter cited as *SWP*.

88. Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witch Crisis of 1692* (New York: Vintage, 2003), 31; Walter W. Woodward, "New England's Other Witch-Hunt: The Hartford Witch-Hunt of the 1660s and Changing Patterns in Witchcraft Prosecution," *OAH Magazine of History* 17, no. 4 (2003): 16–23.

89. *A tryal of witches at the assizes held at Bury St. Edmonds for the count of Suffolk on the tenth day of March, 1664* (London: William Shrewsbury, 1682), 58.

90. Ibid., 42–43.

91. Ibid., 45.

92. Ibid., 47.

93. Cotton Mather, *Memorable Providences, Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions* (Boston: R.P., 1689), sec. 2.

94. As Mary Beth Norton argues, the complaints of the girls could not have gone forward without the explicit backing of adults. Yet as the trial transcripts clearly indicate, the children were vital to the progression of the proceedings. Again and again their visible sufferings, and their descriptions of their afflictions, supply the force that allows the trials to expand. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 306.

95. Ibid.

96. See Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*, 157.

97. Brewer's *By Birth or Consent* does an excellent job of charting this shift.

98. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 319–20.

99. Letter from George Burroughs to the Governor's Council in Boston, January 27, 1692, cited in Frances Hill, *The Salem Witch Trials Reader* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2000), 182.

100. Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, in *Women's Captivity Narratives*, ed. Katherine Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 14.

101. Ibid.

102. Reverend John Hale, *A Modest Enquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft . . .*, 1702, in *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648–1706*, ed. George Lincoln Burr (New York, 1914), 413.

103. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 51.

104. The exception to this case proves the rule. Ann Hutchinson felt she had the authority to challenge ecclesiastical authority. Her trial and subsequent banishment proves that the ministers did not agree.

105. Lawson, *A Brief and True Narrative*, in Burr, *Narratives*, 147–48.

106. *SWP* 2:593–94.

107. *Ibid*., 683–84.

108. *Ibid*.

109. Nancy Ruttenberg, *Democratic Personality: Popular Voice and the Trial of American Authorship* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 35.

110. Increase Mather, *Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits Personating Men*, in Cotton Mather, *Wonders of the Invisible Worlds To Which is added, A farther account of the trials of the New-England Witches by Increase Mather* (London: J.R. Smith, 1862), 237. I am grateful to Nancy Ruttenberg, whose work pointed me to this source.

111. Robert Pike to Jonathan Corwin, in Charles Upham, *Salem Witchcraft* (New York: Dover, 2000), 2:544.

112. For a discussion of the distinction between a powwow and a pniese, see William S. Simmons, *Spirit of the New England Tribes: Indian History and Folklore 1620–1984* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1986), 39–45.

113. Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America: or, An Help to the Language of the Natives in That Part of America, Called New-England* (London: Printed by Gregory Dexter, 1643), 117.

114. Matthew Mayhew, *A Brief Narrative of the Great Success Which the Gospel hath Had, among the Indians of Martha's-Vineyard* (Boston, 1720), 11–12.

115. Edward Winslow, *Good Newes from New England: A True Relation of Things Very Remarkable at the Plantation of Plimoth* (London, 1624), 56.

116. Morton, *New English Canaan*, 34.

117. Ibid., 36.

118. Matthew Mayhew, *Brief Narrative*, 12.

119. Rowlandson, *Sovereignty and Goodness*, 39.

120. Ibid.

121. Edward Ward, *A Trip to New England. In Boston in 1682 and 1699*, ed. George Parker Winship (Providence, R.I.: Club for Colonial Reprints, 1905), 67, quoted in Simmons, *Spirit of the New England Tribes*, 50.

122. *SWP* 2:584.

123. Ibid., 585.

124. Ibid., 587.

125. Anonymous, *The tryal, condemnation, and execution of three vvitches: viz. Temperace [sic] Floyd, Mary Floyd, and Susanna Edwards* (London: J. Deacon, 1682).

126. Anonymous, *Great news from the west of England being a true account of two young persons lately bewitch'd in the town of Beckenton in Somerset-shire* (London: Printed by T.M., 1689), 2.

127. Ruttenberg, *Democratic Personality*, 37.

1. Ann Eliza Bleecker, *A History of Maria Kittle in a Letter to Miss Ten Eyck* (Hartford: John Babcock, 1802), 342.

2. For an excellent treatment of how Goethe's child acrobat Mignon works as a site where adult interiority is articulated, see Carolyn Steedman, *Strange Dislocations: Childhood and the Idea of Interiority, 1780–1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).

3. Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2000), 304.

4. John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 28.

5. Etienne Bonnot de Condillac, *La Logique, ou les premiers developpemens de l'art de penser* (Paris, 1780), 13, cited and translated in Adriana S. Benzaquen, "Childhood, Identity and Human Science in the Enlightenment," *History Workshop Journal* 57 (2004): 39.

6. Hugo Grotius, *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis (Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1948)* bk. 2, chap. 2, sec. 2 §1.

7. Barbara Arneil, "John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism," *History of Political Thought* 13, no. 4 (1992): 590.

8. Arneil makes this argument in the article cited above.

9. John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, 2nd ed., ed. Crawford Brough Macpherson (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1980), bk. 2, sec. 49.

10. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), bk. 1, ch. 2, p. 27.

11. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Émile*, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: Orion Publishing Group, 2000) 205.

12. John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, in *"Some Thoughts Concerning Education" and "Of the Conduct of the Understanding,"* ed. Ruth W. Grant and Nathan Tarcov (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1996), sec. 48.1, p. 33.

13. Ibid.

14. Jacques Cartier, *Shorte and Briefe Narration (Cartier's Second Voyage)*, in *Early English and French Voyages, Chiefly from the Hakluyt, 1534–1608*, ed. Henry Burrage (New York: Scribners, 1906), 68.

15. Benjamin Rush, "An oration, delivered February 4, 1774, before the American Philosophical Society, held at Philadelphia. Containing, an enquiry into the natural history of medicine among the Indians in North-America, and a comparative view of their diseases and remedies, with those of civilized nations. Together with an

appendix, containing, proofs and illustrations," (Philadelphia, 1774), in *Early American Imprints, Series 1: Evans, 1639–1800*, 11.

16. Andrew Fitzmaurice, "Classical Rhetoric and the Promotion of the New World," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58, no. 2 (1997): 221–43.

17. Ibid., 227.

18. Stoler, *Haunted by Empire*.

19. Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 82.

20. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Émile*, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: Orion Publishing Group, 2000), 17.

21. Ibid., 15.

22. Ibid.

23. Joseph Francois Lafitau, *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times*, ed. and trans. William N. Fenton and Elizabeth Moore, 2 vols. (Toronto: Champaign Society 1974–1977), quoted in *The Indian Peoples of North America: A Documentary History of the Sexes*, ed. James Axtell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 38.

24. Ibid., 38–39.

25. Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 186.

26. William Robertson, *The History of America*, 9th ed. (London: A. Strahan, 1800), 2:233. I am indebted to Stephen J. Kunitz's article for alerting me to this valuable source. Stephen J. Kunitz, "Benjamin Rush on Savagism and Progress," *Ethnohistory* 17, nos. 1 and 2 (1970): 31–42.

27. Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

28. Ibid., 17.

29. Ibid., 58.

30. Adam Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. D. D. Raphael and A. I. Macfie (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982), pt. 1, ch. 5, sec. 3, p. 24.

31. For a connection between Cato discourse and the American Revolution, see J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975). Also see Frederic M. Litto, "Addison's Cato in the Colonies," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3, no. 23 (1966): 431–49.

32. As I discussed in chapter 1, the Salem witch trials — which focused on elaborately suffering children — brought with it the terrifying assertion that the visible signs of sainthood were no more than diabolically inspired performances.

33. Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: the Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 183.

34. Elaine Forman Crane "'I Have Suffer'd Much Today': The Defining Force of

Pain in Early America," in *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America*, ed. Ronald Hoffman, Mechal Sobel, and Fredrika Teute (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1997), 370–403.

35. Mary Rowlandson, "True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mary Rowlandson," in *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 67.

36. F. J. Harvey Darton argued that Janeway was second only to Bunyan in widespread and long-lived popularity in English nurseries. F. J. Harvey Darton, *Children's Books in England*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 54.

37. James Janeway, *A Token for Children: Being an Exact Account of the Conversion, Holy and Exemplary Lives and Joyful Death of Several Young Children* (Boston: Thomas and John Fleet, 1781), 23.

38. David Brainerd, *An Account of the Life of Mr. David Brainerd, Minister of the Gospel* (Edinburgh: John Gray and Gavin Alston, 1765), 3.

39. Elizabeth Hanson, "God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty, Exemplified in the Captivity and Redemption of Elizabeth Hanson," in *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 67.

40. Ibid.

41. "Account of the Sufferings of Massy Herberson and her Family," in *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642–1836*, ed. Richard VanDerBeets (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), 214.

42. Jackson Johonnot, "Remarkable Adventures of Jackson Johonnot," in *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642–1836*, ed. Richard VanDerBeets (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), 230.

43. Peter Williamson, *French and Indian Cruelty; Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune*, (York: N. Nickson, 1757), 6.

44. Teresa Toulouse, *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity and Royal Authority in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 12. For other treatments of the ambivalent role the Indian plays in early American imaginations, see Philip DeLoria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Joshua Bellin, *The Demon of the Continent: Indians and the Shaping of American Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965); Robert F. Berkhofer Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

45. Williamson, *French and Indian Cruelty*, 10.

46. Ibid.

47. Thanks to Karen Sánchez-Eppler for her keen feedback on this scene.

48. The tale was retold by Thomas Hutchinson in 1795, Timothy Dwight in 1821–22, John Greenleaf Whittier in 1831, Nathaniel Hawthorne in 1836, and Henry Thoreau in 1849.

49. Cotton Mather, "A Notable Exploit; wherein, *Dux Faemina Facti*," from *Magnalia Christi Americana*, in *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 58–60.

50. Ibid., 60.

51. Toulouse, 67.

52. Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, 83.

53. "A Surprising Account of the Discovery of a Lady," in *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (Penguin: New York, 1998), 89.

54. Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*, in *The Thomas Paine Reader*, ed. Michael Foot and Isaac Kramnick (New York: Penguin, 1987), 26.

55. For more on the prevalence of the liberty vs. slavery debate, see Jared Gardner, *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of an American Literature, 1787–1845* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

56. Shepard Kollack, "A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan," in *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*, ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola (New York: Penguin, 1998), 110.

57. John Locke, *Conduct of the Understanding*, sec. 45.

58. Kollack, "True Narrative," 110.

59. Ibid., 110–11.

60. Michelle Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682–1861* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1997).

61. Committee Report, January 22, 1818, in *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 2:151.

62. I am indebted to Maureen Konkle's excellent analysis of these cases in her article, "Indian Literacy, U.S. Colonialism, and Literary Criticism," *American Literature* 69, no. 3 (1997): 457–84, n. 64.

63. *Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. William M'Intosh*, 21 U.S. 589 (1823).

64. Ibid., 590.

65. *Worcester v. State of Georgia*, 31 U.S. 547 (1832).

66. *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia*, 30 U.S. 17 (1831).

67. Ibid., 23–24.

68. Washington Irving, *The Sketch-book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent*, 1819–1820, http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/2048, 158.

69. Laura Donaldson, "Son of the Forest, Child of God," in *Postcolonial America*, ed. C. Richard King (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 209.

70. Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 88.

71. Arnold Krupat, *The Voice in the Margin: Native American Literature and the Canon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 147.

72. Konkle, "Indian Literacy," 458.

73. Hillary Wyss, *Writing Indians: Literacy, Christianity and Native Community in Early America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000), 589.

74. William Apess, *A Son of the Forest*, in *Son of the Forest and Other Writings*, ed. Barry O'Connell (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), 6. All subsequent Apess references are from this text, and page numbers will be noted parenthetically.

75. Barry O'Connell, introduction to *Son of the Forest and Other Writings, ed. Barry O'Connell* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), x.

76. Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500–1650* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 133–34.

77. Laura M. Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

78. Ibid., 140.

79. Experience Mayhew, *Indian Converts; Or, Some Account of the Lives and Dying Speeches of a Considerable Number of the Christianized Indians of Martha's Vineyard in New England* (London: Samuel Gerrish, 1727), 231.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid., 242.

82. Ibid.

83. James Janeway, *A Token for Children*, preface, no. 8.

84. I am indebted to Julie Siever's wonderful analysis of Janeway's text in her conference paper: Julie Sievers, "'Not Too Little to Dye, Not Too Little to Go to Hell': Janeway's *Token for Children* and Literatures of Death," Society of Early Americanists Conference, Williamsburg Va., 2007.

85. Donaldson, "Son of the Forest," 203.

86. See Robert Warrior, "Eulogy on William Apess: Speculations on his New York Death," *SAIL* 16, no. 2 (2004): 1–13.

87. William Apess, *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians of the Pequot Tribe*, in *Son of the Forest and Other Writings*, ed. Barry O'Connell (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), 63.

88. See Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U. S. Imperialism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

89. Apess, *Experiences of Five Christian Indians*, 59.

1. Thomas Paine, *American Crisis XIII*, in *The Rights of Man, Common Sense, and Other Political Writings*, ed. Mark Philip (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 73.

2. Much recent criticism has concerned itself with whether sensibility was a central element in republican theory or was antithetical to the republican ideal. Bryce Traister, for instance, argues that classical republicans were deeply suspicious of a feminized sensibility. Bryce Traister, "Libertinism and Authorship in America's Early Republic," *American Literature* 72, no. 1 (March 2000), 1–30. David Waldstreicher, on the other hand, stresses connections between republicanism and sensibility in his book *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1997). Julie Ellison, as I discuss at length in chapter 2, argues that the classical republican "Cato discourse" pivoted on an often melodramatic scene of sentimental loss duly suppressed by the republican hero. Rather than making a case either for or against sentiment's role in republican stoicism, I seek to place *The Coquette* and *Charlotte Temple* in a context in which sentiment and stoicism shaped each other.

3. Jan Lewis calls *Clarissa* "a political parable with particular lessons for Americans." Jan Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic," *William and Mary Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1987): 693.

4. For an excellent analysis of the implications of Clarissa's possible pregnancy, see Brian McCrea, "Clarissa's Pregnancy and the Fate of Patriarchal Power," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 9.2 (1997): 125–48.

5. Elizabeth Maddock Dillon, *The Gender of Freedom: Fictions of Liberalism and the Public Sphere* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 12.

6. Wendy Brown, *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1995), 156–57.

7. Cornelia Hughes Dayton, *Women Before the Bar: Gender, Law and Society in Connecticut 1639–1789* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1995), 163.

8. John Rogers, "Death the Certain Wages of Sin" (Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1701), 2.

9. Dayton, *Women Before the Bar*, 161.

10. New Haven Colony Code of 1656, in *Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven, from May, 1653, to the Union*, ed. Charles J. Hoadly (Hartford, 1858), 600. Quoted in Dayton, *Women Before the Bar*, 163.

11. Dayton, *Women Before the Bar*, 167–71.

12. Ibid., 161.

13. According to Carole Shammas, the median age of first marriage for females

in pre-1750 England was about twenty-five, and from nineteen to twenty-three in British North America. Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 182.

14. Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*, 300.

15. Richard Allestree, *The Whole Duty of Man* (London, 1703), 107–8.

16. Lewis, "Republican Wife," 695.

17. Eve Keller points out that Harvey's theorem posted a decided threat to biblical and political investments in patriarchal power, which insisted that men had the prominent share in the regeneration process. Eve Keller, "Making Up for Losses: The Workings of Gender in William Harvey's *de Generatione animalum*," in *Inventing Maternity: Politics, Science, and Literature, 1650–1865*, ed. Susan Greenfield and Carol Barash (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1999), 34–56. Ava Chamberlain, "The Immaculate Ovum: Jonathan Edwards and the Construction of the Female Body," *William and Mary Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (2000): 289–322.

18. Keller, "Making Up for Losses," 38.

19. Ibid., 39.

20. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C. B. Macpherson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 254.

21. William Smith, *New Voyage to Guinea* (London, 1744), 210. I am grateful for Jennifer Morgan's work, which alerted me to this source.

22. See Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Domesticating 'Virtue': Coquettes and Revolutionaries in Young America," in *Literature and the Body: Essays on Populations and Persons*, ed. Elaine Scarry (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 160–84.

23. Fliegelman, *Prodigals to Pilgrims*, 135.

24. My reading of Eliza's feelings differs somewhat from Jeffrey Richards's, who argues that Eliza often betrays her sincerity in her dealings with Boyer and Sanford. I do agree, however, with Richards's larger point that *The Coquette* renders the fallen woman a victim of the irreconcilable tension between social performance and transparent sincerity. Jeffrey H. Richards, "The Politics of Seduction: Theater, Sexuality and National Virtue in the Novels of Hannah Foster," in *Exceptional Spaces: Essays in Performance and History*, ed. Della Pollack (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1998), 245.

25. Hannah Webster Foster, *The Coquette*, with introduction by Cathy Davidson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 56. All future citations will be parenthetical, to this edition.

26. Richards, "Politics of Seduction," 249.

27. See Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Domesticating 'Virtue,'" 160–84, and Gillian Brown "Consent, Coquetry and Consequences" *American Literary History* 9, no. 4 (Winter 1997), 625–52.

28. Susannah Rowson, *Charlotte Temple*, in "*Charlotte Temple*" *and* "*Lucy Temple*," ed. Ann Douglas (New York: Penguin 1991), 46. All future citations will be parenthetical, to this edition.

29. Richard Brodhead, "Sparing the Rod: Discipline and Fiction in Antebellum America," *Representations* 21 (1988): 67–96.

30. For an excellent analysis on the exploration of science and sensibility in the eighteenth century, see Jessica Riskin, *Science and Sensibility: The Sentimental Empiricists of the French Enlightenment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

31. Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, sec. 48.

32. Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* 2.11.

33. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Émile* (London: Everyman's, 1993), 385.

34. Gillian Brown, "Consent, Coquetry and Consequences," *American Literary History* 9, no. 4 (Winter 1997), esp. 628–29.

35. Rousseau, *Émile*, 478.

36. Marion Rust, "What's Wrong with *Charlotte Temple*?" *William and Mary Quarterly*, 60, no. 1 (2003): 27 par. 4. http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/wm/60.1/rust.html.

37. Karen Sánchez-Eppler, "Bodily Bonds: The Intersecting Rhetorics of Feminism and Abolition," *Representations* 24 (1988): 36.

38. Aristotle [pseud]., *Aristotle's Compleat Masterpiece in Three Parts,* 16th ed. (London: Printed and sold by the booksellers, 1725), 95.

39. Ibid., 96.

40. Franny Nudelman, "'Emblem and Product of Sin': The Poisoned Child in *The Scarlet Letter* and Domestic Advice Literature," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 10, no. 1 (1997): 194.

41. Linda Kerber, "The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment — An American Perspective." *American Quarterly* 28.2 (1976): 188.

42. For more on Charlotte as childlike, see Ann Douglas, Introduction, "*Charlotte Temple*" *and* "*Lucy Temple*," ed. Ann Douglas (New York: Penguin, 1991).

43. Susan Juster, *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics and Evangelicalism* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1994), 18.

44. Israel Loring, "The Nature and Necessity of the New Birth" (Boston: D. Henchman, 1728), 8.

45. George Whitefield, *The Marks of the New Birth* (Philadelphia: Andrew and William Bradford, 1742), 19.

46. See Nancy Ruttenberg, *Democratic Personality and the Trial of American Authorship* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 104–5.

47. For more on Whitefield's ambivalent relationship with the stage, see Ruttenberg, *Democratic Personality*, 89–91.

48. Rowlandson, "The Sovereignty and Goodness of God," 50.

49. Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the Word* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

50. Perry Miller's reading of the jeremiad provides an eloquent analysis of New England ministers' analysis of affliction as affirmation. See Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Boston: Belknap, 1956).

51. Laura Henigman, *Coming into Communion: Pastoral Dialogues in Colonial New England* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 14.

52. Jennifer Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 47.

53. Edward Long, *History of Jamaica* (London: T. Lowndes, 1774), 380.

54. Edwards's *A Treatise On Religious Affections* is perhaps the most extensive meditation on this subject in the eighteenth-century United States.

55. Jonathan Edwards, *Images of Divine Things*, entry 190, in *Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 2, *Typological Writings*, ed. Mason I. Lowance Jr. with David Watters (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 122.

56. John Leake, *Practical Observations on the Child-bed Fever*, 7th ed. (London: Baldwin, Murray and Egerton, 1792), 45.

57. Edwards, *Images of Divine Things*, entry 18.

58. Rust, "What's Wrong," par. 12.

59. Julia Stern, *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1997), 80.

60. George Whitfield, "A Penitent Heart is the Best New Year's Present," sermon 32, http://www.reformed.org/documents/index.html?mainframe=/documents/Whitefield/WITF_032.html

61. Ruttenberg, *Democratic Personality*, 91.

62. For the working of maternal grief in these texts, see Julia Stern "Working Through the Frame," in *The Plight of Feeling*, particularly 55–56, and Douglas, introduction to "*Charlotte Temple*" *and* "*Lucy Temple*," xxx.

63. For instance, Foster erases Elizabeth Whitman's work as a poet, and as an active member in literary circles of the day.

64. Cathy Davidson has suggested that "the sentimental novel may well have been the most effective means of birth control of the time." Cathy Davidson, *The Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 193.

CHAPTER FOUR. The Revolutionary Child

1. William Hill Brown, *The Power of Sympathy*, in "*The Power of Sympathy*" *and* "*The Coquette*," with an introduction by Carla Mulford (New York: Penquin, 1996), 10.

2. For a more thorough explication of the rhetorical links between slavery and seduction in the late eighteenth century, see Anna Mae Duane, "Susannah Rowson, Hannah Webster Foster, and the Seduction Novel in the Early U.S.," in *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*, ed. Leonard Cassuto, Clare Eby, and Benjamin Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

3. As critics such as Gillian Brown and Holly Brewer have illustrated, and as I have discussed in the previous chapter, political rhetoricians often drew upon the figure of the child to form the conceptual framework for the development of natural rights theory and the revolutionary ideology that expanded upon that theory. Gillian Brown, *The Consent of the Governed: The Lockean Legacy in Early American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*.

4. For more on the child's role in Revolutionary rhetoric, see Shirley Samuels, *Romances of the Republic: Women, the Family and Violence in the Literature of the Early American Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Levander, *Cradle of Liberty*.

5. See Fliegelman, *Prodigals and Pilgrims*, on the popularity of Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* in the colonies.

6. Edwin G. Burrows and Michael Wallace, "The American Revolution: The Ideology and Psychology of National Liberation," *Perspectives in American History* 6 (1972): 287.

7. Priscilla Wald, "Future Perfect: Grammar, Genes and Geography," *New Literary History* 31, no. 4 (2000): 697. For more on the child as an insistent symbol of a particular form of "reproductive futurity," see Lee Edelman, *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

8. Caroline Field Levander, "'Let Her White Progeny Offset Her Dark One': The Child and the Racial Politics of Nation Making," *American Literature* 76 (June 2004): 221–46.

9. Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*, 5.

10. Allison to Ezra Stiles, October 20, 1768, quoted in Winthrop Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1968), 299.

11. *Petition from the General Congress in America to the King*, Gilder Lehrman Collection GLC 219.01 Morgan Library, NYC.

12. Ibid.

13. John Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government*, 1690, 6th ed. (London: A. Millar et al, 1764) pars. 56 and 57.

14. Brown, *Consent of the Governed*, 119.

15. Alexander Martin, *America, a Poem* (Philadelphia: Andrew Steuart, 1769) lines 45–54, p. 4.

16. Daniel Fowle, *A total eclipse of liberty: Being a true and faithful account of the arraignment, and examination of Daniel Fowle before the Honourable House of Representatives of the province of the Massachusetts-Bay in New-England, Octob. 24th 1754*. (Boston: Daniel Fowle, 1755), 9.

17. Quoted in Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by UNC Press, 1996), 136.

18. Lucia Hodgson, "Colonizing the Social Contract: Children, Slavery and Race in William Fleetwood's *Relative Duties*," unpublished dissertation, 2009.

19. Brewer, *By Birth or Consent*, 5.

20. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1770–1823* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

21. Samuel Miller, "A Discourse Delivered April 12, 1797 at the Request of and Before the New-York Society for Promoting the Manumission of Slaves and Protecting Such of Them as Have Been or May be Liberated" (New York: T. and J. Swords, 1797), 11, 12.

22. Ibid., 14.

23. David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 158.

24. Ibid., 158, 159.

25. Robin Blackburn, "Haiti, Slavery, and the Age of Democratic Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (2006): 643–74; Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Belknap: Harvard University Press, 2005), 102–3.

26. "Ode à la philanthropie," translated and quoted by Jeremy Popkin in "Facing Racial Revolution: Captivity Narratives and Identity in the Saint-Domingue Insurrection," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 36, no. 4 (2003): 514.

27. Lynn Avery Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 53.

28. See Shirley Samuels and Russ Castronovo for engaging analyses of the murderous child of revolutionary rhetoric. Samuels, *Romances of the Republic*; Castronovo, *Fathering the Nation*.

29. Popkin, "Facing Racial Revolution," 521; Gros, *An Historick Recital of the*

Different Occurrences in the Camps of Grand-Reviere [sic] Dondon, Saint-Suzanne, and others, from the 26th of October, 1791, to the 24th of December, of the same year (Baltimore: Samuel and John Adams, n.d.) Evans cat. no. 24368, p. 24.

30. "Ode à la philanthropie," 514.

31. Tim Matthewson, "Abraham Bishop, 'The Rights of Black Men,'" *The Journal of Negro History* 67, no. 2 (1982): 152. Bishop's work was originally published in *The Argus* (Boston), Dec. 6, 1791.

32. Ibid., 153.

33. Theodore Dwight, *An oration, spoken at Hartford, in the state of Connecticut, on the anniversary of American independence, July 4th, 1798* (Hartford: Printed by Hudson and Goodwin, 1798).

34. See chapter 2 in this book.

35. Bryan Edwards, *The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies* (London, 1807), 3:99.

36. "To James Monroe," July 14, 1793, in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 26, ed. John Catanzariti (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 503.

37. The Constitution was redrafted in 1806. For a useful collection of literary readings of legal documents, see Kimberle Crenshaw, et al., *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement* (New York: New Press, 1995). See particularly Cheryl Harris's essay, "Whiteness as Property" from this volume (276–91).

38. For an analysis of the figurative language in the constitution, see Anne Gulick, "We are Not the People: The 1805 Haitian Constitution's Challenge to Political Legibility in the Age of Revolution," *American Literature* 78, no. 4 (2006): 799–820.

39. The Haitian Constitution of 1805, *New York Evening Post*, July 15, 1805.

40. Jan Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic," *WMQ* 44, no. 4 (1987): 689–721.

41. *Lettres de Toussaint-L'Ouverture*, La Bibliothèque Nationale (MSS Dept) quoted in C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, 2nd ed. (New York: Vantage, 1989), 149.

42. Prince Saunders, *Haytian papers, 1818. An address delivered at Bethel Church, Philadelphia: 1818. A memoir presented to the American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, 1819* (Philadelphia: Historic Publications, 1969), 27.

43. Ibid., 28.

44. Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 96.

45. Thomas Laqueur, "Bodies, Details and the Humanitarian Narrative," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Karen Halttunen, "Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-

American Culture," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (1995): 303–34. Marianne Noble offers a sophisticated reading of the masochistic possibilities of suffering victims in sentimental literature in *The Masochistic Pleasures of Sentimental Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

46. Gabrielle Forman, "'Reading Aright': White Slavery, Black Referents and the Strategy of Histotextuality in Iola Leroy," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 10, no. 2 (1997): 327–54.

47. Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 203.

48. Wilma King, *African Childhoods: Historical Perspectives from Slavery to Civil Rights* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 19.

49. Carole Shammas, "Black Women's Work and the Evolution of Plantation Society in Virginia," *Labor History* 26 (1985): 9.

50. Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives*, 115.

51. David Geggus, "Sex Ratio, Age and Ethnicity in the Atlantic Slave Trade: Data from French Shipping and Plantation Records." *The Journal of African History* 30, no. 1 (1989): 23–44; Herbert S. Klein, Stanley L. Engerman, Robin Haines, and Ralph Shlomowitz, "Transoceanic Mortality: The Slave Trade in Comparative Perspective," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 58, no. 1 (2001): 93–118.

52. David Eltis, "The Fate, Identities, and Significance of Africans Liberated from the Transatlantic Slave Trade: An Overview," lecture, Yale University, October 23, 2008.

53. Phillis Wheatley, "On the Death of a young Lady of Five Years of Age," in Phillis Wheatley, *Complete Writings*, ed. Vincent Carretta (New York: Penguin, 2001), 13.

54. Phillis Wheatley, "To the Right Honourable WILLIAM, Earl of DARTMOUTH, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for North-America, &c.," in Phillis Wheatley, *Complete Writings*, ed. Vincent Carretta (New York: Penguin, 2001), 39.

55. Stephen Carl Arch, *After Franklin: The Emergence of Autobiography in Post-Revolutionary America 1780–1830* (New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire Press, 2001).

56. Vincent Carretta, *Equiano the African: Biography of a Self-Made Man* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005), xiii.

57. Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography*, 11. (University of Virginia etext 1909 version) http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/Fra2Aut.html

58. Ibid., 11.

59. Ibid., 13.

60. Ibid., 14.

61. See Carretta, *Equiano, the African*.

62. Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, The African, Written by Himself*, ed. Vincent Carretta (New York: Penguin, 2003), 47.

63. Ibid., 47.

64. Ibid., 26.

65. Ibid., 28.

66. Ibid., 10.

67. Quobna Ottobah Cugoano, *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil of Slavery* (New York: Penguin, 1999), 12.

68. James Albert Ukawsaw Gronniosaw, *A Narrative of the Most Remarkable Particulars in the Life of James Albert Ukawsaw Gronniosaw*, in *Unchained Voices: An Anthology of Black Authors in the English-Speaking World of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Vincent Carretta (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), 36.

69. Venture Smith, *Narrative of the Life*, 373.

70. For a recent account that takes issue with Vincent Carretta's reading of Equiano's origins, see John Bugg, "The Other Interesting Narrative: Olaudah Equiano's Public Book Tour," *PMLA* 121, no. 5 (2006): 1424–42.

71. Moses Mitchell, interview by Bernice Bowden, November 3, 1938, Slave Narratives of the WPA Federal Writers' Project, Arkansas Narratives, vol. 2, pt. 5, Library of Congress Web site, http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/P?mesn:1:./temp/~ammem_lwcN::

72. "The Life Story of George Taylor Burns," Slave Narratives of the WPA Federal Writers' Project, Indiana Narratives, Volume 5, Library of Congress Web site, http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/P?mesn:1:./temp/~ammem_oDAa::

73. Equiano, *Interesting Narrative*, 36.

74. Ibid., 25.

75. Ibid., 37.

76. Ibid., 37.

77. Carretta, *Equiano the African*, 45.

78. Equiano, *Interesting Narrative*, 48.

79. Ibid., 51.

80. Frederick Douglass, *My Bondage and My Freedom* (New York: Miller, Orton & Mulligan, 1855), 361.

81. Joshua Peel, *Devout Breathings of the Soul to God* (York: Wilson, Spence and Mawman, 1793). I am indebted to Vincent Carretta's biography for pointing me to this important source. Quoted in Carretta, *Equiano the African*, 16.

82. Darold D. Wax, "A Philadelphia Surgeon on a Slaving Voyage to Africa, 1749–1751," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 94 (1968): 472.

83. Ibid., 488.

84. Ibid., 487.

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid., 488.

87. Ibid., 487.

88. Ibid., 490.

89. Larry Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701–1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990). Kathleen M. Brown notes that the idea of the planter reigning over a family that included slaves had begun to enter planter discourse by the 1730s. Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives*, 365.

90. Chancellor Harper, "Influence of Slavery on Social Life," in *Cotton is King, and Pro-slavery Arguments*, ed. E. N. Elliott (Augusta, Ga.: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, 1860), 573.

91. Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage, 1976), 443.

92. James Kirke Paulding, *Letters from the South*, in *Paulding's Works* (repr., New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835), 5:96–98, quoted in Tise, *Proslavery*, 46.

93. Edwards, *History, Civil and Commercial*, 193–94.

94. Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* 2.18.2.

95. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Memorial Edition, ed. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh, 20 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1903–04), 19:41.

96. Samuel Stanhope Smith, *Lectures, Corrected and Improved* (Trenton, 1812), 2:159–79.

97. Alondra Nelson, "Introduction: Future Texts," *Social Text* 20 (271) (2002): 4.

98. Paul Youngquist, "The Afro-Futurism of DJ Vassa," *European Romantic Review* 16, no. 2 (2005): 185.

99. My use of the word "rerouting" here pays homage to Paul Gilroy's play on the relationship between routes and routs in the *The Black Atlantic*, and on Paul Youngquist's deployment of these terms in his discussion of Equiano's texts. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

100. Equiano, *Interesting Narrative*, 51.

101. Venture Smith, *Narrative of the Life*, 382.

102. David Waldstreicher, *Runaway America: Benjamin Franklin, Slavery and the American Revolution* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 243.

103. Philip Gould, "Free Carpenter, Venture Capitalist: Reading the Lives of the Early Black Atlantic," *American Literary History* 12, no. 4 (2000): 677.

104. Venture Smith, *Narrative of the Life*, 373.

105. Jane I. Guyer and Samuel M. Eno Belinga, "Wealth in People as Wealth

in Knowledge: Accumulation and Composition in Equatorial Africa," *Journal of African History* 36 (1995): 114.

EPILOGUE

1. Sánchez-Eppler, *Dependent States*.

2. Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Narratives* (Cambridge: Harvard, 2005), 4.

3. See, for example, *Essex Patriot* (Haverhill, Mass.), July 17, 1817, 1.10, p. 1.

4. Stoler, *Haunted by Empire*, 3.

5. Quoted in Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building* (New York: New American Library, 1980), 99.

6. Quoted in William Lloyd Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization: Or An Impartial Exhibition of the Doctrines, Principles and Purposes of the American Colonization Society. Together with the Resolutions, Addresses and Remonstrances of the Free People of Color* (1832; repr., New York: Arno Press, 1968), 2:44–45.

7. *Laws of the state of New-York. Passed at the twenty-second session, second meeting, of the Legislature, begun and held at the city of Albany, the second day of January, 1799* (Albany: Printed by Loring Andrews, printer to the state, 1799).

8. Ibid., 722.

9. For an excellent analysis of the conflicted conversations around nineteenth-century black nationalism, see Robert S. Levine, *Dislocating Race and Nation: Episodes in Nineteenth-Century American Literary Nationalism* (Chapel Hill, UNC Press, 2008).

10. For one example of recent scholarship that revisits the influence of the ACS, see Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Making of America* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2007).

11. "Investigator," *Freedom's Journal*, August 31, 1827.

12. NYAFS Records, vol. 3: 27–29. These records are held at the New-York Historical Society.

13. Ibid., 54.

14. William Hamilton, *Address to the 4th Annual Convention of the Free People of Color of the United States. Delivered at the Opening of their Session in the City of New-York, June 2, 1834* (New York: S. W. Benedict & Co. Printers, 1834), 5.

15. James McCune Smith, introduction to *Memorial Discourse*, by Henry Highland Garnet (Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, 1865).

16. Laura Donaldson, "Making a Joyful Noise: William Apess and the Search for Postcolonial Method(ism)," in *Messy Beginnings: Postcoloniality and Early American*

Studies, ed. Edward Watts and Malini Schueller (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 29–44.

17. *Freedom's Journal*, October 3, 1828.

18. Excerpts from both papers can be found in Charles C. Andrews, *History of the New-York African Free Schools* (New York: Mahlon Day, 1830).

19. *Christian Advocate and Journal and Zion's Herald* (New York), April 3, 1829, 110. Quoted in Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak*, 25.

20. See chapter 2 of this book for a detailed analysis of this report.

21. *Niles Weekly Register*, March 13, 1830, 53–54, quoted in John M. Coward, *The Newspaper Indian: Native American Identity in the Press, 1820–1890* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 78.

This page intentionally left blank

Addison, Joseph, 67; *Cato*, 67–68, 73
adultery, 101
African colonization, 18, 167, 169
African Free School, 132, 167–68, 173–76. *See also* New York African Free School
Afro-Futurism, 160
Age of Revolution, 17, 135
Allestree, Richard, 104
Allison, Francis, 128–29
"America, a Poem" (Martin), 130
American Colonization Society, 168–71
American Crisis XIII (Paine), 97–98
American Monthly Magazine and Critical Review, 174
Andrews, Charles C., 170, 172
antebellum schools, 18
Apess, William, 8; and Christianity, 90–91, 92, 94; and conversion, 83–84; and Furmans, 88–89, 91, 92–93; and grandmother, 16, 85–87, 88–89; and Indian identity, 61, 82–83; and Judge Hillhouse, 94; as mimicking colonizers, 83–84; and role of adults, 94–96
— works of: *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians*, 84, 94–95; *Son of the Forest*, 16, 61, 82–96
Aristotle's Compleat Masterpiece, 113
Ayres, Goody, 45

Bhabha, Homi, 31, 83
Bishop, Abraham, 136
black nationalism, 169
Black Skin, White Masks (Fanon), 10
Bonaparte, Napoleon-Francois-Charles-Joseph, 173
Boyer, Jean-Pierre, 170
Bradstreet, Anne, 34, 144
Brainerd, David, 71, 90
Breslaw, Elaine, 43, 52
Brief Narrative, A (Matthew Mayhew), 52
Brown, William Hill, 108
Bury St. Edmunds (witch trials), 45–46, 49, 51, 55

Calvinism: and affliction, 69; and childrearing, 33, 62; New Light, 71, 78, 116
captivity narratives, 5, 6, 16, 38, 68; Algonquian, 40; captive as child in, 39; captor as caretaker in, 40; captor as disciplinarian in, 40; of Dustan, 75–77, 79; feminization of, 39; of Ferguson, 40; of Kittle, 58, 60; in Maine, 47; Panther narrative, 76. *See also* Rowlandson, Mary
Cato (Addison), 67–68, 73
Chancellor, William, 153–56
Charlevoix, Pierre de, 34
Charlotte Temple (Rowson), 17, 98–124; Lucy Temple, 123; Montraville, 123
chastity, 102, 123
Cherokee, 80, 167, 175
Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831), 81. *See also* Native American legislation

childbirth, 17, 101, 106–7, 117; death in, 119, 123
childrearing practices, 14, 16, 37, 109; colonist views of Native American, 14, 27, 34, 40, 74; corporal punishment, 64, 86, 142; and government, 30, 166; hardening, 62, 63, 65, 66; manuals, 15, 36, 113; of Narragansett tribe, 35; of Native Americans, 42, 61, 65, 67, 180n5; of New Englanders, 27, 29; in slavery, 106, 142
children: as accusers, 42–57; American colonies as, 6; as commodities, 19, 22; as cultural emissaries, 20, 27, 50; as diplomatic tools, 24, 27; as gifts, 19, 23; and legal contract, 47; malleability of, 31, 132; as martyrs, 72; as metaphors, 9–13; as parental legacy, 28; as property, 104; as settlers, 22; as spiritual emissaries, 52, 56; as subjects, 29; as symbols, 10, 27; as transparent (emotionally), 72; as victims, 7
Choctaw, 175
Christian Converts (Experience Mayhew), 90
Christianity, 27; and disobedience, 36; God as father in, 36; Indian conversion to, 25, 30, 83, 175; and parental affection, 35; and repentance, 36; theology in, 69
citizenship, 7, 108; and African Americans, 141, 159, 162, 166–67, 171; child as citizen-to-be, 67, 69, 127, 128, 130; citizen-subject, 74, 100, 176; conquered persons as, 80; duties of, 16, 22; exclusion from, 6, 13, 126, 129; as independent status, 64, 66, 105, 107; and men, 6, 7; and women, 104, 165
Clarissa (Richardson), 99, 101, 104–5, 109, 127–28
Clay, Henry, 169
cognitive theory, 9, 12, 65
Collins, John, 152
Commercial Advertiser, The, 174
Committee for the "Emigration of Person of Colour to the Republic of Hayti," 170
consent: and children, 4, 6, 7, 130, 178n12; and citizenship, 6, 128; and colonial relations, 137, 138, 139–41; legal age of, 47; and marriage and reproduction, 104, 107; parental, for children, 104; and pregnancy, 99, 107, 115; and sexuality, 106; and slavery, 94, 126–27, 132; and women, 99, 103, 105, 122, 125
constitutional theory, 17
Continental Congress (1774), 129
Coquette, The (Foster), 17, 98–124; Reverend Boyer, 108–9, 112, 120–21; Peter Sanford, 108–9, 112, 120
Corey, Martha, 44, 47, 51
Cugoano, Quobna Ottobah, 149

"Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians," 30
Defoe, Daniel, 63–64
De Jure Belli Ac Pacis (Grotius), 62
Dewey, Loring, 170
disability, 7, 66
Discourse on the Origin of Inequality (Rousseau), 63, 65–66
divination, 54
Douglass, Frederick, 152
Dustan, Hannah, 75–77, 79

Edwards, Bryan, 137, 157
Edwards, Jonathan, 118–19
Eliot, John, 13, 30, 36
Eltis, David, 14, 143
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 7
Émile (Rousseau), 63–64, 66, 166
England, as parent, 4, 16, 99, 123, 127, 137
Enlightenment, 6, 16, 139, 166, 169
epigenesis, doctrine of, 105, 113
Equiano, Olaudah, 8, 146, 150, 151, 152, 160–62; grief of, for mother, 149; and mimicry of whites, 161; separation of, from family, 148
Essay Concerning Human Understanding, An (Locke), 110
Experiences of Five Christian Indians, The (Apess), 84, 94–95

"Family Well-Ordered, A" (Cotton Mather), 38, 40–41
Fanon, Frantz, 10
Ferguson, Mary, 40
Fields, James, 169, 171, 172
Filmer, Robert, 29
Foster, Hannah, 17, 98, 107. See also *Coquette, The*
Franklin, Benjamin, 68, 94, 128, 146, 151; apprenticeship of, 147; and self-agency, 147; separation of, from parents, 147–48
Freedom's Journal, 174
Free People of Color of the United States, Fourth Annual Convention of, 171

Garnet, Henry Highland, 152, 169, 172
Garrison, William Lloyd, 152, 169
Generall Historie of Virginia (John Smith), 23, 25
"God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty" (Hanson), 71
Gold, Colonel, 175
Good, Sarah, 44
Good Newes from New England (Winslow), 52
Great Awakening, 71, 98, 116, 118–22
grief, 35, 76–77; maternal, 34, 73, 77, 86–87, 122, 144; paternal, 155; proprietary, 155
Gronniosaw, James Albert Ukawsaw, 149
Gros, Mr., 135
Grotius, Hugo, 62

Haitian Constitution (1805), 138–39
Haitian Revolution, 133–40
Hale, John, 5, 47, 48
Hale, Matthew, 47
Hamor, Ralph, 23–24; *True Discourse*, 23
Hanson, Elizabeth, 71
Harper, Chancellor, 156
Hartford, Conn. (witch trials), 45, 51
Harvey, William, 105
Hathorne, Judge John, 44, 46, 47, 50, 55
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 75; *The Scarlet Letter*, 101, 114
Haytian Papers (Saunders), 139
Haywood, Oliver, 37
Historick Recital, of the Different Occurrences (Gros), 135
History of America (Robertson), 67
Hobbes, Thomas, 105
Hooker, Thomas, 39
Hubbard, Betty, 44, 55
Hutchinson, Anne, 4, 32–33, 185n104

Indian removal, 18, 79, 166–67
infanticide: as justification for violence, 75; and Native Americans, 59, 60, 79, 81; and race, 136–37; and sin, 101–2, 106; and women, 101
infantilization: of African Americans, 26, 158, 159; in captivity narratives, 13, 39, 83, 94–95; and colonization, 10, 14, 130; and education, 166, 175; and empowerment, 7, 11, 16, 133, 134; and information transfer, 10; and pregnancy, 122, 124, 125, 126; and slavery, 112, 115, 141, 155; in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 1, 153
information transfer, 10–11
Irving, Washington, 82

Janeway, James, 75, 90–95; *Token for Children*, 70–71, 90, 95
Jefferson, Thomas, 4, 12, 137, 157–58, 161
Johnson v. M'Intosh (1823), 80
Johonnot, Jackson, 72
Journal of John Winthrop, The (Winthrop), 15–16, 31

Key, Francis Scott, 169
Key into the Language of America, A (Roger Williams), 35, 52
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, A (Stowe), 153
King Philip's War, 37, 47
Kinnan, Mary, 77–78
Kittle, Maria, 58, 60

Lafitau, Joseph Francis, 66
Lancasterian method, 139
Lawson, Deodat, 44, 48–49
Leake, John, 119
literature, American, 3, 7–8, 11–12, 84, 164
Locke, John, 100; and American colonies, 4; on childrearing, 70, 109–11, 128, 167, 169; on corporal punishment, 86, 110; and habit, 158; on malleability, 106, 125, 127, 130, 140; on mind-body relationship, 16, 77, 111; on Native Americans, 79; on natural man, 62–64, 145, 146; on revolutionary child, 17, 129, 157; on self-possession, 98; and social contract theory, 6
— works of: *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 110; *Second Treatise of Government*, 17, 63, 128
Loring, Israel, 116
L'Ouverture, Touissant, 139

Madison, James, 167
Magnalia Christi Americana (Cotton Mather), 40
manumission, 168; manumission society, 172; New York Manumission Society, 132, 169, 170
marriage, 100, 138, 192n13; of children, 47, 104; of Pocahontas, 24–25; as sign of adulthood, 104, 106, 107; and status, 104; women's role in, 105, 106
Martin, Alexander, 130–31
maternal impression, 113–14
maternal rights, 105; and indentured servitude, 106; and slavery, 106
Mather, Cotton, 5, 71; and child martyr, 93; and obedience of children, 38–42, 70; and Salem witch trials, 46–48
— works of: "A Family Well-Ordered," 38, 40–41; *Magnalia Christi*

Americana, 40; *Memorable Providences*, 46; *A Token for Children of New England*, 70
Mather, Increase, 14, 37–38, 51
Mayhew, Experience, 90–91, 92; *Christian Converts*, 90
Mayhew, Matthew, 53; *A Brief Narrative*, 52
Memorable Providences (Cotton Mather), 46
Middle Passage, 153
Miller, Samuel, 132
mimicry, 40, 48, 76, 83–84, 95
Mitchell, Moses, 150
Moniteur Général, 134, 135
Morton, Thomas, 30–31; "New English Canaan," 22, 30, 53

Native American: conversion of, to Christianity, 25, 30, 83, 175; education of, by whites, 175; as independent, 67; as stoic, 61, 64, 65; as students, 80; as unemotional, 79
Native American legislation, 83, 88; *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), 81; *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), 80; and Justice Marshall, 88; *Worchester v. State of Georgia* (1832), 80
natural man, 61–63, 65, 116
New England, 22, 38, 45, 101–2
New England's First Fruits, 22, 36
New England's Prospect (Wood), 22
"New English Canaan" (Morton), 22, 30, 53
New Haven, Conn., 101, 103
New York African Free School, 132, 167, 170, 173–76; examination days, 169
Nurse, Rebecca, 49–50, 55

Paine, Thomas, 4, 76–77, 121–22, 124, 127; *American Crisis XIII*, 97–98
Panther Captivity, 76
parricide, 134–35
Parris household, 5, 44, 48, 52–53
paternalism, 13
Patriacha (Filmer), 29
patriarch: and colonial relations, 41, 105, 135; as guardian, 17, 120, 130; and Native Americans, 61; and pregnancy, 105–6, 113; and slavery, 15, 130, 159; and society, 98
Paulding, James Kirke, 157
Peel, Joshua, 152
Pike, Robert, 51
Pleas of the Crown (Matthew Hale), 47
pniese, 52, 186n112
Pocahontas, 15, 22–27; conversion of, to Christianity, 25
Power of Sympathy, The (Brown), 108
Powhatan (chief), 19, 23–24
Powhatan (people), 23, 25, 180n5
Powhatan (town), 19
powwow, 50–57, 186n112
predetermination, 69
preformation, doctrine of, 105
pregnancy, 108; and citizenship, 107; and disenfranchised populations, 107, 143; as position of power, 105, 106, 118; and sexuality, 103, 123; and spiritual redemption, 111–12, 113, 115, 117–22; and violence, 101; and women's self-agency, 17, 98; and women as childlike, 99, 122
Proctor, John, 50
property, 76, 80, 138; as citizenship term, 127, 162; community, 62; humans as, 104, 107, 124; private, 62

proslavery arguments: as necessary evil, 156; and royalist fathers, 135; slaves as children, 5, 157, 158–59, 167
Protestantism, American, 71, 90, 117
puerperal fever, 119
Puritan, 14, 16, 27, 33; baptism, 37; belief as salvation, 32; body as permeable entity, 69–70, 71, 101, 115; captivity narratives, 16, 39–40, 61, 69, 119; childrearing, 14, 33–34, 40, 42; colonization, 31; contamination by Devil, 32; cultural exchange, 20, 27; emotional responses, 34, 35; household, 37, 40, 49, 59; and Native Americans, 32, 36, 57; parent-child relationships, 27, 28, 29, 43; redemption, 101–2, 106; social order/obedience, 33, 37, 39, 43, 49; theology, 50–51, 56
Putnam, Ann, 44, 50–51, 55

Raleigh, Walter, 19
Rawls, John, 6
Records of the Virginia Company, 25–26
Reformation, 104
Richardson, Samuel, 102, 107; *Clarissa*, 99, 101, 104–5, 109, 127–28
Robertson, William, 67
Robinson, John, 33, 35
Robinson Crusoe (Defoe), 63–64
Rogers, Esther, 101, 106
Rolfe, John, 24, 25, 26
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: and children, 62, 63, 65–67, 70, 166; on mind-body relationship, 16, 64; on natural man, 63, 65, 145; and social contract theory, 6; and women, 111–12
— works of: *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, 63, 65–66; *Émile*, 63–64, 66, 166
Rowlandson, Mary, 55, 59; suffering of, 34, 39, 48, 54, 70, 117
Rowson, Susanna, 17, 127; *Charlotte Temple*, 17, 98–124
Rush, Benjamin, 65

Saint Domingue, 133, 135–37
Salem, Mass., 5, 16
Salem/Essex (witch trials), 20, 32, 38, 42–57; as response to fear of Indian raids, 48
Saunders, Prince, 139
Scarlet Letter, The (Hawthorne), 101, 114
Second Treatise of Government (Locke), 17, 63, 128
sentimentalism: and African Americans, 141, 142, 146, 152; and captivity, 78; in parent-child relationships, 149, 177n6; and whites, 3, 83, 86, 112
Sketch-book (Irving), 82
slavery: and abolitionists, 86, 132, 142, 152; apologists for, 15, 140; and children, 129, 131, 141, 143–46, 153–56; Christianity and terms for, 131; and corporal punishment, 142; and lack of adult responsibility, 125, 157; loss of parents in, 145; maternity in, 106–7, 143; and permanent children, 157
Smith, Adam, 68; *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 59
Smith, James McCune, 172–73
Smith, John, 13, 19, 22–26; *Generall Historie of Virginia*, 23, 25; letters to Queen Anne, 23, 24, 25; *True Relation*, 23

Smith, Samuel Stanhope, 158
Smith, Venture, 145–46, 149–50, 160–62; and capitalism, 162–64; and *minkisi*, 163
social contract theory, 6, 7
Son of the Forest (Apess), 16, 61, 82–96
Spellman, Henry, 19, 23
Sterne, Laurence, 113
Stoler, Ann Laura, 8, 65, 166
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 1, 2, 86, 140–41; *A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 153; *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 1–3, 86, 153, 177n3
symbolic economy, 37, 114

Tappan, Arthur, 169
Theory of Moral Sentiments, The (Adam Smith), 59
Tituba, 52, 53
Token for Children (Janeway), 70–71, 90, 95
Token for Children of New England, A (Cotton Mather), 70
touch test, 45, 46, 51
Transatlantic Slavery Database, 14, 143
Trip to New England, A (Ward), 54
Tristam Shandy (Sterne), 113
True Discourse (Hamor), 23
True Relation (John Smith), 23

Uncle Tom's Cabin (Stowe), 1–2, 86, 153; Eva, 1–3; Uncle Tom, 1–2, 177n3

Virginia, 13, 15, 19, 22–23

Wampanoag, 48, 54
Ward, Edward, 54
Warren, Mary, 50
water test, 45, 51, 55
Webster, Daniel, 169
Wheatley, Phillis, 144–45, 150
Whitefield, George, 71, 75, 116, 119–21
Whole Duty of Man, The (Allestree), 104
Williams, Abigail, 44, 49, 50, 55
Williams, Roger, 35, 52
Williamson, Peter, 72, 74, 77, 79
Winslow, Edward, 52–53; *Good Newes from New England*, 52
Winthrop, John, 3, 4, 13, 27–29, 31–33; *The Journal of John Winthrop*, 15–16, 31; and social body, 27, 33
Winthrop, John, Jr., 45
witch trials: Hartford, 45, 51; spectral evidence in, 51; touch test in, 45, 46, 51; water test in, 45, 51, 55. *See also* Bury St. Edmunds; Salem/Essex
women, 4, 5, 11, 16, 165; as captives, 137, 183n75; of color, 101, 106–7, 118, 143; in court proceedings, 44, 51; emotional modulation of, 108, 111–12; as settlers, 22; and sexuality, 102–3; as subjects, 100; as victim, 48, 193n24; as violent, 73, 75–77
Wood, William, 35; *New England's Prospect*, 22
Worcester v. State of Georgia (1832), 80
WPA (Works Progress Administration), 150